





BS

2615

6583

1890

v.2





Robert E. Spear

July 1895





COMMENTARY

ON THE

GOSPEL OF JOHN

WITH AN

HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL INTRODUCTION

BY

F. GODET,

DOCTOR IN THEOLOGY AND PROFESSOR IN THE FACULTY OF THE  
INDEPENDENT CHURCH OF NEUCHÂTEL.

---

VOL. II.

---

TRANSLATED FROM THE THIRD FRENCH EDITION

WITH A

PREFACE, INTRODUCTORY SUGGESTIONS,

AND ADDITIONAL NOTES

BY

TIMOTHY DWIGHT,

PRESIDENT OF YALE COLLEGE.

**New York**

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY

LONDON AND TORONTO

1893

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1886,  
By FUNK & WAGNALLS,  
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress at Washington, D. C.

## PREFATORY NOTE.

---

THIS work of Godet, in its third French edition, is published in three volumes, one of which contains the introductory matter and the other two the Commentary. In this American translation the preface to the whole work is placed, as in the French edition, at the beginning of the first volume ; but as the translation is issued in two volumes instead of three, it has been thought best to insert the author's preface to the Commentary at the opening of the second volume, instead of placing it in the middle of Vol. I., where the Commentary itself begins. The table of contents of the Commentary, which in the original work is found at the end of Vol. III., is also placed at the beginning of this second volume.

The American Editor would call the attention of the reader to his own additional notes on the chapters of the Gospel (VI.-XXI.) which are included in this volume, and would ask his consideration of the thoughts and suggestions presented in them. These additional notes will be found on pages 457-542.

TIMOTHY DWIGHT.

*New Haven, July 4th, 1886.*



## PREFACE TO THE COMMENTARY

### IN THE THIRD FRENCH EDITION.

---

It is not without a feeling of hope that I present to the Church the third edition of this Commentary, the introductory volume of which appeared in 1881. At the time when I first published this work, the two theories of Baur and Reuss held sway over scientific thought, one in Germany, the other in France. The former taught us to see in the Johannean narrative scarcely anything but a romance designed to illustrate the idea of the Logos and to cause it to pervade the Church. The other showed a little more respect to the history related in this book, but regarded the discourses inserted in this framework simply as the theology of the author himself, whoever he was, John or some one else ; theology which he had himself derived from the contemplation of Jesus and from his Christian experience.

When we follow attentively the progress of opinion, we are struck with the change which is gradually taking place in the estimate of this sacred writing. To speak only of points of most importance, Renan, in the masterly dissertation which he has placed at the end of the thirteenth edition of his *Vie de Jésus*, has, by the soundest analysis, demonstrated the indisputably historical character of the greater part of John's narratives, and the superiority to the Synoptic story which must be accorded to them in many respects. The following, moreover, is the way in which he expressed himself, last year, in a conversation reported in the *Christianisme au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle* (April, 1884) : "The historical character of the Fourth Gospel is continually more impressive to me. When reading it, I say to myself : It is so." If *it is so*, what becomes of Baur's opinion !

Hase, in his *History of Jesus* (1876), has given in the Introduction a very careful study of the sources of this history, especially of the Gospel of John. He decides, it is true, for its non-authenticity, but after having laid down a series of preambles which lead directly to the opposite conclusion. One feels that he must have overcome by sheer force of will all the scientific reasons which were most fitted to justify the contrary conviction. And one is easily

convinced that the ground of this decision, which is contrary to the premises, is nothing else than the rationalistic denial of the miraculous. A judgment can be formed from these words of the venerable writer : "Through the golden breastplate of the Logos-doctrine we feel (in the Jesus of the Fourth Gospel) the beating of a true human heart which is moved by joy and grief, and in this picture *we recognize the apostle* with all the fulness of his recollection." At what a distance we are from the estimates of Baur and Keim !

The two most considerable works, in relation to our subject, which have appeared in Germany in these most recent days, are the *Commentary on the Gospel of John* by Bernhard Weiss (in the collection of Meyer's Commentaries, sixth edition, 1880) and the *Life of Jesus* by the same author (1882). The historical verity of the entire narrative of John is fully recognized and proved. As to the discourses, Weiss no doubt makes partial concessions to criticism, which I cannot regard as sufficiently justified ; the readers will be able to judge of them for themselves. But the difference as compared with Reuss is nevertheless a difference *toto cælo*, so that the few imported elements which Weiss allows do not in the least degree compromise, in his view, the authenticity of the book.

It may well be expected that this return movement will not be unanimous. The Tübingen school has not ceased to work in the direction which was given to it by the genius of its master. We will mention here only the writing in which this tendency has, so to speak, reached its climax. It is that of A. Thoma : *Die Genesis des Johannes-Evangeliums* (1882). On one point this author breaks with the tradition of the school : he acknowledges the close relations of our Gospel to Judaism and the Old Testament. But, on the other side, to what a phantasmagoria of allegorizing does the imagination of this writer surrender itself ! The discoveries of Baur and Reuss on this path are astonishingly surpassed. It is not a history of Jesus, it is that of Christianity itself that the author of our Gospel, an Alexandrian Christian of the second century, wished to write. From the condition of infancy described by the Synoptics, the new religion had arrived at the brilliant period of youth. Already all sorts of elements had arisen in the Church and were struggling in the midst of it. The personages who play a part in our Gospel are nothing else then personifications, freely created, of these different tendencies. Caiaphas is false prophecy ; the brethren of Jesus represent carnal Israel struggling against the Church. Pilate is the Roman despotism ; the Greek proselytes of ch. xii. personify paganism eager for truth. The different Christian parties are also represented, in particular by the family at Bethany ; the party of works, by Martha ; that of faith, by Mary ;

Christian Essenism, by Lazarus. The most skilful turn in this *jeu d'esprit* is the explanation of the person of James, the brother of Jesus. It is Judaism under its form which is hostile to Christianity. His name is designedly suppressed throughout the whole narrative, but is replaced by that of Judas ; nevertheless, allusion is made to its signification, *the supplanter*, in the passage, xiii. 18, where Jesus recalls to mind the words of Psalm xli. : "He that eats bread with me has *lifted up his heel* against me." One will form an idea of the author's critical method when he learns, for example, that the passage John i. 13 : "*Those who are born not of blood nor . . . but of God,*" was composed by the Alexandrian author by means of the following three passages : Rom. viii. 29 ("the first-born among many brethren") ; Heb. ii. 13 ("with the children whom God has given me") ; 1 Cor. xv. 48 ("as the heavenly, . . . so the heavenly"). Such are specimens of what at the present day is called, by this party, the discovery of the genesis of the Fourth Gospel.

Happily these excesses, which may be called the Saturnalia of criticism, seem also to have contributed, according to their measure, to bring the minds of men back to sobriety and good sense. We gather together, with satisfaction, testimonies like the following :

Franke, a young scholar teaching at Halle, has recently published a work under the title : *Das alte Testament bei Johannes*, a work full of sagacity and sound erudition, in which he proves what I also have sought to prove, that the thought of the author of the Fourth Gospel penetrates with all its fibres into the soil of the Old Testament. The following is the way in which he expresses himself, as he closes his preface : "A continuous study of the writings of John has led me with ever-increasing force to the conviction that their interpretation cannot be undertaken with success except by decidedly maintaining their composition by John the apostle."

Another young scholar, Schneeder mann, Professor at Basle, in his work : *Le judaisme et la prédication chrétienne dans les évangiles* (1884), writes the following lines : "When in the period of my academic course I came to the explication of the Fourth Gospel, I was uncertain respecting its origin, but determined to declare without mental reservation that I must remain undecided, and why I must remain so. . . . To my own surprise, the result of my work was the discovery, set forth in what precedes, that the cause of the Fourth Gospel and of the evangelic history is not in so bad a state as some would have us believe. . . . The impression to which I have been brought is, that there is nothing to oppose our seeing in the author of the Fourth Gospel a richly gifted Jewish thinker, of a powerful religious

enthusiasm, and our recognizing in this author, conscious of his character as eye-witness, the apostle John.”

These voices which rise in the midst of the younger generation and the concordant experiences which they express are of good augury ; they announce a new phase of criticism. This is the reason why, as I began, I expressed a feeling of hope. Following upon this violent crisis, there is verified anew that old motto which has become that of the Gospel of John :

Tant plus à me battre on s’amuse,  
Tant plus de marteaux on y use.

I hope that I have neglected nothing which could contribute to keep this Commentary at the height of the scientific work which is carried on at the present day, with so much solicitude, in relation to the Fourth Gospel. I have especially derived great advantage from the Commentaries of Weiss and Keil, which have appeared since my previous edition. There will scarcely be found a page in this book which does not present traces of work designed to improve it and to render it less unworthy of its object.

May the Lord give strength and victory to His Word in the midst of the Church and throughout the world !

F. GODET.

*Neuchâtel, March 21st, 1885.*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS OF THE COMMENTARY.

	PAGES
INTRODUCTION TO THE COMMENTARY, . . . . .	I. 221-239
Chap. I. The plan of the Gospel, . . . . .	221-230
Chap. II. The preservation of the text, . . . . .	230-237
The Title of the Gospel, . . . . .	238-239
 PROLOGUE, i. 1-18, . . . . .	 240-298
First Section : The Logos, i. 1-4, . . . . .	243-253
Second Section : Unbelief, i. 5-11, . . . . .	253-263
Third Section : Faith, i. 12-18, . . . . .	263-283
General considerations respecting the Prologue, . . . . .	283-298
 FIRST PART : FIRST MANIFESTATIONS OF THE WORD ; BIRTH OF FAITH ;	
FIRST SYMPTOMS OF UNBELIEF, i. 19-iv. 54, . . . . .	299-447
<i>First Cycle</i> , i. 19-ii. 11, . . . . .	300-355
First Section : The testimonies of John the Baptist, . . . . .	
i. 19-37, . . . . .	300-322
The testimonies of the Forerunner, . . . . .	322-325
Second Section : Beginnings of the work of Jesus ; birth . . . . .	
of faith, i. 38-52, . . . . .	325-338
The Son of man, . . . . .	338-342
Third Section : The first miracle ; strengthening of faith, . . . . .	
ii. 1-11, . . . . .	342-352
On the miracle of Cana, . . . . .	352-355
<i>Second Cycle</i> , ii. 12-iv. 54, . . . . .	355-447
First Section : Jesus in Judea, ii. 12-iii. 36, . . . . .	355-415
The brethren of Jesus, . . . . .	357-361
Second Section : Jesus in Samaria, iv. 1-42, . . . . .	415-441
Third Section : Jesus in Galilee, iv. 43-54, . . . . .	441-447
 SECOND PART : THE DEVELOPMENT OF UNBELIEF IN ISRAEL, v.-xii., I. 448-II. 240	
<i>First Cycle</i> , v.-viii., . . . . .	I. 451-II. 155
First Section : First outbreak of hatred in Judea, v. . . . .	
1-47, . . . . .	I. 452-492
Second Section : The great Messianic testimony and the . . . . .	
crisis of faith in Galilee, vi. 1-71, . . . . .	II. 1-52
Third Section : The conflict at its highest stage of inten- . . . . .	
sity, at Jerusalem, vii. 1-viii. 59, . . . . .	52-125

	PAGES
<i>Second Cycle</i> , ix., x., . . . . .	125-169
First Section : The miracle, ix. 1-41, . . . . .	125-139
Second Section : The first discourse, x. 1-21, . . . . .	139-155
Third Section : The second discourse, x. 22-42, . . . . .	155-169
<i>Third Cycle</i> , xi., xii., . . . . .	169-240
First Section : The resurrection of Lazarus, xi. 1-57, . . . . .	169-196
On the resurrection of Lazarus, . . . . .	196-201
Second Section : The last days of Jesus' ministry, xii. 1-36, . . . . .	201-230
Third Section : Retrospective glance at the mysterious fact of Jewish unbelief, xii. 37-50, . . . . .	231-240
<b>THIRD PART : THE DEVELOPMENT OF FAITH IN THE DISCIPLES</b> , xiii.-xvii., . . . . .	241-347
First Section : The facts, xiii. 1-30, . . . . .	242-262
Second Section : The discourses, xiii. 31-xvi. 33, . . . . .	262-323
Third Section : The prayer, xvii. 1-26, . . . . .	323-347
<b>FOURTH PART : THE PASSION</b> , xviii., xix., . . . . .	348-411
First Section : The arrest of Jesus, xviii. 1-11, . . . . .	349-353
Second Section : The trial of Jesus, xviii. 12-xix. 16a, . . . . .	354-382
Third Section : The crucifixion of Jesus, xix. 16b-42, . . . . .	382-398
On the day of Jesus' death, . . . . .	398-411
<b>FIFTH PART : THE RESURRECTION</b> , xx. 1-29, . . . . .	412-433
On the resurrection of Jesus, . . . . .	426-433
<b>CONCLUSION</b> , xx. 30, 31, . . . . .	434-436
<b>APPENDIX</b> , xxi. 1-25, . . . . .	437-456
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR</b> , . . . . .	
Introductory Suggestions on the Internal Evidence, . . . . .	I. 493-512
Notes on Chapters I.-V., . . . . .	I. 513-559
Notes on Chapters VI.-XXI., . . . . .	II. 457-542

# GOSPEL OF JOHN.

## SECOND PART CONTINUED.

---

### SECOND SECTION.

#### VI. 1-71.

##### THE GREAT MESSIANIC TESTIMONY AND THE CRISIS OF FAITH IN GALILEE.

THE war is now declared in Judea; the thread of the narrative is outwardly broken. John does not mention the return of Jesus to Galilee. But it is there that we find Him again at the beginning of chap. vi., and He remains there, after this, so long and with such persistency that He even astonishes His relatives; as we read in chap. vii. This sojourn in Galilee includes the whole interval between the feast of Purim, in March (chap. v.), and the feast of Tabernacles, in October (chap. vii.), consequently seven consecutive months, in which it is natural to place the greater part of the events of the Galilean ministry described by the Synoptics.

This continued sojourn in Galilee and this long retirement in which Jesus keeps Himself away from Jerusalem, are the more striking since during this part of the year, two of the three great Israelitish feasts occurred at which the Jews were most anxious to be present, the Passover and Pentecost. The conduct of Jesus, therefore, needed explanation. This explanation appears from vii. 1: "*And Jesus sojourned in Galilee; for He would not sojourn in Judea, because the Jews sought to put Him to death.*"—The sixth chapter is thus the continuation of the fifth, in the sense that the continued sojourn of Jesus in Galilee, the most striking event in which is related in chap. vi., was the result of the violent conflict which had brought about the removal of Jesus from Jerusalem after the miracle and the long discourse related in chap. v. Morally speaking, therefore, the thread of the story is not broken.

But why, among the whole multitude of facts which filled the ministry of Jesus in Galilee, did John select this one which is related in chap. vi., and this one only? *Reuss* thinks that the narrative which John gives of this scene so well described by the Synoptics is incompatible with the idea that he proposed to himself to complete them. There is an exception here, it is true, but it is explained without difficulty. For this purpose it is enough to go back to the idea which governs this whole part—that of the development of the national unbelief. The end of the

sixth chapter will bring us to see that the point of time here described was that in which there was consummated in Galilee a crisis similar to that which occurred in Judea, with this difference, already indicated, that the unbelief in Judea is violent and aggressive, and can end only in murder, while in Galilee, where it proceeds from a simple feeling of being deceived after over-wrought expectation, it occasions only indifference: there is no killing, there is a going away and a going not to return (vv. 66, 67). As *Weiss* says: 'The Galilean half-way faith becomes unbelief. The revelation of Jesus' glory by means of the two miracles and of the discourses related in this chapter forms everywhere the basis of the narrative. But the special aim of this narrative is to describe the sad result in which such great favors issue in Galilee, as in Judea. In this very province, where faith for a moment seemed to have taken root (iv. 45), the Messianic work, as such, failed; and here also, the saying had to find its fulfillment: "*He came to His own, and His own received Him not.*" In the midst of this great disaster, however, the work of Jesus continued its peaceful and humble growth in a few; it even gained at this critical moment the most glorious tribute (vv. 68, 69).

*Beyschlag* has set forth the way in which the miracle of the multiplication of the loaves, by provoking the sudden explosion of the political hopes which were smouldering under the ashes among the Galilean people, brought to light the complete incompatibility which existed between the common Messianic idea and that of Jesus, and made evident the moral necessity of the rupture. John alone had apprehended the historic bearing of this decisive epoch in the ministry of Jesus; and this is the reason why he alone was able to present it in its true light. Here is what explains for us the exception which he has made in favor of this narrative, which he found already reproduced in the writings of those who preceded him, and the reason why he thought fit to concentrate in the representation of this event the summary of the entire Galilean ministry.

There are three parts in this chapter: 1. The two miracles: vv. 1-21; 2. The conversations and discourses which are connected with them: vv. 22-65; 3. The final crisis: vv. 66-71.

### I.—*The Miracles*: vv. 1-21.

#### 1. The Multiplication of the Loaves: vv. 1-13.

Vv. 1, 2. "After these things, Jesus withdrew to the other side of the Sea of Galilee, which is the Sea of Tiberias. 2. And<sup>1</sup> a great multitude followed him, because they saw<sup>2</sup> the miracles which he did<sup>3</sup> on<sup>4</sup> the sick."—If the facts related in chap. v. really occurred at the feast of Purim, those which are reported in chap. vi. took place only a few weeks afterwards (ver. 4), and the indefi-

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  B D L some Mss. Italic Cop. read  $\delta\epsilon$  instead of  $\kappa\alpha\iota$ .

<sup>2</sup> Instead of  $\epsilon\omega\rho\omega\nu$ ,  $\epsilon\theta\epsilon\omega\rho\omega\nu$  is read in A and  $\epsilon\psi\text{-}\epsilon\omega\rho\omega\nu$  in B D L.

<sup>3</sup> T. R. reads  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$   $\tau\alpha$   $\sigma\eta\mu\epsilon\iota\alpha$ .  $\aleph$  A B D K L S  $\Delta$  H It. Syr. Vulg. Cop. reject  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$ .

<sup>4</sup>  $\aleph$  reads  $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota$  instead of  $\epsilon\pi\iota$ .

nite connecting words *μετὰ ταῦτα*, *after these things*, are very suitable to this inconsiderable interval. *Meyer*, pressing the meaning of *μετὰ ταῦτα*, understands: "immediately after this sojourn in Judea." The *ἀπῆλθεν*, *went away*, would thus signify that He returned from Jerusalem to the country east of the Jordan; and *the multitude* mentioned in ver. 2 would be that which accompanied Jesus on His return from Judea. But, observes *Luthardt*, John could not have expressed himself in this way: Jerusalem was not in direct relation to the eastern shore of the Sea of Galilee. And how could these multitudes have accompanied Jesus to a remote distance from Judea at the very time of the Passover which called them to go to Judea. It is obvious that ver. 2 is the description of a general situation, on the basis of which the following scene is separately sketched (precisely as ii. 23-25 in relation to iii. 1-21, or iii. 22-24 to iii. 25-36, or iv. 43-45 to iv. 46-54). This is John's manner of narrating. This character of general picturing appears in the imperfect *ἠκολούθει*, *were following*, *έώραν*, *were seeing*, *έποιεί*, *was doing*, in contrast with the aorist *ἀνῆλθε*, *went up* (ver. 3), which ushers in the account of the particular events which the author has in view. John omits therefore the express mention of the return to Galilee which is self-evident from vv. 43-45, and he means to say that Jesus began anew the Galilean work related by the Synoptics, which was marked by daily miracles, and in the course of which He was constantly accompanied by considerable multitudes. It was consequently from some point on the western side of the Sea of Galilee that He thought fit to retire to the opposite side *πέραν* (*beyond*). *Reuss*, placing himself at the opposite extreme to *Meyer*, says, "All this shows us that we do not here have a strictly chronological narrative, as has been very gratuitously supposed." The truth is that John, describing the historical development of Jewish unbelief, puts this scene in its true place, but without describing all the details of the events which preceded and followed.

John says nothing of the motives which led Jesus to this step, but the word *ἀπῆλθεν* *went away*, seems to indicate a seeking for solitude. And, indeed, according to Mark vi. 30, and Luke ix. 10, the apostles had just rejoined their Master, after having accomplished their first mission, and Jesus desired to give them some rest and to pass a short time alone with them. Moreover, according to Matt. xiv. 13, He had just heard of the murder of John the Baptist, and, under the shock of this news, which gave Him a presentiment of the nearness of His own end, He needed to collect His thoughts and to prepare His disciples for that other catastrophe. Thus our four narratives easily harmonize. Luke names Bethsaida as the place near which the multiplication of the loaves occurred. It has been claimed that he understood thereby Bethsaida in the neighborhood of Capernaum, and, consequently, that this event occurred, according to him, on the west shore. But Luke would, thus, put himself in contradiction, not only with the other evangelists, but with himself; for he says that Jesus withdrew with His disciples *into a desert place* belonging to a city called Bethsaida. Now this purpose of Jesus does not allow us to think of the city of Bethsaida, on the western shore, where He was in the centre of His activity and

was always surrounded by crowds. Josephus (*Antiqq.* xviii. 2. 1 and 4. 6) speaks of a city which had the name *Bethsaida Julias*, situated at the northeastern extremity of the sea of Tiberias; and the expression *Bethsaida of Galilee*, by which John xii. 21 designates the native city of Peter, Andrew and Philip (i. 45), has no significance unless there really existed a Bethsaida outside of Galilee. It is this one of which Luke means to speak. Bethsaida Julias was in Gaulonitis, in the tetrarchy of Philip, on the left bank of the Jordan, a little way above the place where it falls into the lake of Gennesaret. It was there that Philip died and was magnificently interred. (*Furrer, Schenkel's Bibellex.*, I., p. 429.) If John had written in Galilee, and for Palestinian readers, he would have contented himself with the ordinary expression: *sea of Galilee*. But as he was writing outside of Palestine, and for Greeks, he adds the explanation: *of Tiberias*. The city of Tiberias, built by Herod Antipas, and thus named in honor of Tiberius, was well known in foreign countries. Thus the Greek geographer, Pausanias, calls the sea of Galilee: *λίμνη Τιβερις*. Josephus uses indiscriminately the two designations here united by John. The imperfect *έώρων*, *they were seeing*, depicts the joy which this ever-renewed spectacle afforded them. The reading of the T. R. *έώρων* is supported by the *Sinaitic MS.* and even by the barbarism, *ιθεώρων*, of the *Alexandrian*. *Weiss* observes that if the mission of the Twelve took place during the journey of Jesus to the feast of Purim (chap. v.), as *Gess* has supposed, the narrative of John accords very well with that of Mark, who places the multiplication of the loaves immediately after the return of the Twelve.

Vv. 3, 4. "*And Jesus went up*<sup>1</sup> *into the mountain, and there he sat down*<sup>2</sup> *with his disciples. 4. Now the Passover, the feast of the Jews, was at hand.*" The expression, *the mountain*, denotes not a particular mountain, which was in the region (for the locality has not been designated), but the mountainous country, in contrast to the level of the shore. Jesus had sought a solitary place there, and was conversing in it with his disciples. John's expression has some resemblance to that of Matt. xv. 29, immediately after the second miracle of the loaves.

What is the purpose of the remark in ver. 4? Is it a chronological note? In that case, it would rather have been placed at the beginning of the narrative. It occurs here incidentally, after the manner of John, as an explanatory remark (comp. i. 24). But with what purpose? According to *Meyer*, to explain the great gathering which is spoken of in ver. 5. But this explanation forces him to distinguish this multitude from that of ver. 2, which is evidently inadmissible. *Weiss* acknowledges this, and sees in ver. 2, and ver. 5, the crowd of pilgrims who are about to go to Jerusalem for the Passover. But what had the caravans going up to this feast to do in this out of the way place? And is it not very clear, from ver. 2, that these numerous arrivals are no others than the multitudes who habitually accompanied Jesus in Galilee? The mention of the feast near at hand, must, therefore, serve to explain, not the presence of the

<sup>1</sup> N D I<sup>161</sup>; ἀπηλθε (went away), for ἀνηλθε.

<sup>2</sup> N D some Mm.; καθέζετο for εκαθητο.

multitudes, but the conduct of Jesus towards them. Not being able to go to Jerusalem for the feast (vii. 1), Jesus, on seeing these multitudes hastening towards Him in the wilderness, recognizes in this unexpected circumstance a signal from the Father. He puts this concourse in comparison with the feast which is about to be celebrated in Jerusalem, and He says for Himself, for His disciples, for the multitude: "We also will have our Passover!" This is the thought which sets in its true light the following miracle, as the discourses which are connected with it prove. For Jesus represents Himself here as the one whose flesh and blood are designed to give life to believers, a point which undoubtedly calls to mind the sacrifice and eating of the Paschal lamb. By this fourth verse John gives us, therefore, the key of the whole narrative, as he had given us in iii. 1, by the words: *of the Pharisees*, that of the whole conversation with Nicodemus. The denials of *Weiss* and *Keil* seem to us to rest on no sufficient grounds. The term ἡ ἑορτή τ. Ἰουδ., *the feast of the Jews*, must, according to *Keil*, explain the word *Passover*, which was unknown to Greek readers, or, according to others, designate this feast as "the feast *par excellence* for the Jews;" but comp. ii. 13, and vii. 2. Perhaps John desires to make us understand the total separation which was more and more evident between Jesus and this people who were becoming foreign to Him. From the incident in Luke vi. 1-5, and the parallel passages, we discover in the Synoptics also a spring season passed in Galilee during the course of the ministry accomplished in that province.

Vv. 5-7. "Jesus therefore, lifting up His eyes and seeing a great multitude coming to Him, says to Philip: Whence shall we buy<sup>1</sup> bread, that these may eat? 6. Now this he said to prove him; for,<sup>2</sup> as for himself, he knew what he was going to do. 7. Philip answered<sup>3</sup> him: Two hundred denarii-worth of bread is not sufficient for them,<sup>4</sup> that every one of them<sup>5</sup> may take a little." John does not say how long the confidential interview of Jesus with His disciples, which is mentioned in ver. 3, continued. The term ἐκάθητο, *he sat there*, ver. 3, which the *Sinaitic MS.* wrongly changes into ἐκαθέζετο proves that He remained for a certain time alone with them while the companies were successively coming up. For it is impossible to imagine five or six thousand persons arriving *all at once* in the locality into which Jesus had withdrawn (this in answer to *Weiss*). While Jesus and His disciples came directly by water from Capernaum or the environs, these crowds of people, who had observed from the western shore the point towards which the bark directed its course, made on foot (πεζῆ, Mark vi. 33; Matt. xiv. 13), the circuit of the northern shore of the lake, and thus arrived successively during the day at the scene of action. According to the Synoptics, Jesus went forth from the solitude (Matt. and Mark) and received them with kindness (Luke). Thus a part of the day was devoted

<sup>1</sup> K U V: αγορασόμεν, instead of αγορασώμεν.

<sup>2</sup> N: γὰρ instead of δε; and afterwards δε instead of γὰρ.

<sup>3</sup> N D: ἀποκρίνεται instead of ἀπεκρίθη; and

N: οὖν instead of αὐτῶ.

<sup>4</sup> N omits αὐτοῖς.

<sup>5</sup> N A B L II and some Mnn. and Vss. omit αὐτῶν (*of them*) which is read here by T. R. with 13 Mj.

to teaching and healing. Then seeing the crowd which was so eager and was continually increasing (Mark vi. 33: "*They ran thither afoot from all the cities*"), Jesus experiences that feeling of profound compassion which Matthew and Mark describe. But another feeling, of which John alone has caught the secret, is predominant in His heart: it is that of joy. No doubt, He had wished to be alone, and this arrival thwarted His purpose. But such earnestness, such perseverance are for Him an irresistible appeal. He enters with eagerness into the new situation which is opened to Him; for He discerns here a thought of the Father and He prepares Himself to give to this body of people the feast for which the opportunity is thus granted Him. Indeed, in John, it is Jesus who takes the initiative; He addresses Himself to Philip: "There are our guests; we must give them supper. Have you already thought of it?" In the Synoptics, it is the disciples who are disturbed about the multitude, and urge Jesus to dismiss them. The need of food may have occupied the minds of Jesus and the disciples simultaneously as they saw the evening drawing on. But as for Jesus, He had already taken His resolution (ver. 6). The thought of what He was going to do had formed itself in His mind during the work of that day. The narrative of the Synoptics is written from the disciples' point of view, which must very naturally have prevailed in the stories emanating from the Twelve, particularly in those of Peter and Matthew, while John, who had read the heart of the Master, brings out the other point of departure—the inward impulse of the Lord. Thus, the disciples address themselves to Jesus and communicate their anxiety to Him. Jesus, having already formed His plan, says to them: "*Give ye them to eat,*" and, in speaking thus, addresses Himself especially to Philip, as we have just seen. Why to him, rather than some other? *Bengel* thinks that he was charged with the care of the *res alimentaria*. But it seems more probable from xiii. 29, that it was Judas who made the purchases. According to *Luthardt*, Jesus wished to bring an educating influence on Philip, who had a hesitating and over-careful character. This is possible. But the playful tone of Jesus' question: "*Whence shall we buy?*" may lead us to suppose that *naïveté* was one of the traits of this disciple's character. This is the reason why Jesus addresses him this question, which was insoluble from the standpoint of natural resources; and he, on his side, answers it with a good-natured simplicity. This slight touch gives an idea of the amenity which prevailed in the relations of Jesus to His disciples; it appertained to the picture of the glory "*full of grace*" of the Word made flesh.

The expression: *to prove him*, does not have the solemn sense which this term ordinarily has. It signifies merely that Jesus desired to see whether, in this situation, he would know how to find the true answer of faith. Philip makes his calculation with prudence. It is good sense, not faith, which speaks through his mouth. The denarius was a Roman coin worth about fifteen cents; two hundred denarii were, therefore, equivalent to thirty dollars of our money; a large sum, which, however, was still far below the necessity of the case! Mark has also preserved this circum-

stance respecting the two hundred denarii; only, he puts this calculation in the mouth of *the disciples* in general. If the connection between the question of Jesus and Philip's answer were not so close in John, we might try to insert here between vv. 6 and 7 the brief conversation of Jesus with the disciples reported in Mark vi. 37. But it is much more probable that the reflection which Mark attributes to the disciples in general is nothing else than the reproduction of Philip's words, which are preserved by John in their most exact historical form.

Vv. 8, 9. "One of his disciples, Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, says to him: 9. *There is a<sup>1</sup> lad here, who<sup>2</sup> has five barley loaves and two fishes: but what are these for so many?*" John mentions, first, in an indefinite way, one disciple; then he makes a precise statement: "It was Andrew." We can believe that we hear him telling the story. And how can we fail to remember here, that Andrew was precisely the one, who, according to the tradition in the Muratorian Fragment, was present at the time of the composition of the Gospel? His character as *brother of Simon Peter* had already been pointed out in i. 41. Was not this sufficient? Certainly; but the person of Andrew cannot present itself to the mind of John, without his recalling to mind how nearly connected he was with Simon Peter, the principal one among the apostles. And yet it is claimed that one of the tendencies of the Johannean narrative is to disparage Peter! Andrew, thus, falls into the trap laid for his fellow-disciple, and it is, no doubt, with a sort of malicious humor that the evangelist is pleased to report *in extenso* their words, which form so strong a contrast to the magnificent display of power which is in preparation. The word *ἐν, one only*, which was restored by Tischendorf in 1859, is suppressed by him in his 8th ed., according to the Alexandrian authorities and Origen; but certainly wrongly. We can more easily understand how it may have been omitted than added. It brings out the scantiness of the resources which are at hand: "*One only* who has anything, and he how little!" It was some petty trader whom Andrew had just noticed in the crowd. Barley-bread was that used by the poorer classes.

Ver. 10. "*But<sup>3</sup> Jesus said: Make the people sit down. Now there was much grass<sup>4</sup> in the place. The men sat down, therefore, in number about<sup>5</sup> five thousand.*"<sup>6</sup> In these scanty provisions Jesus has found that which He needs, the material on which omnipotence can work. Now, in His view, the banquet is prepared, the table spread: "*Make the people sit down.*" He says to His apostles. The mountain-plateaus which rise behind the site of Bethsaida Juliae displayed, at that time, their spring-time verdure. Mark, as well as John, draws the picture of this grassy carpet on which the multitudes took their places (*ἐπὶ τῷ χλωρῷ χόρτῳ* vi. 39). He describes, likewise, the cheerful spectacle which was presented by these regular ranks (*συμπόσια συμπόσια, πρασιαὶ πρασιαὶ*) of hundreds and fifties. Ἄνδρες de-

<sup>1</sup> *Εν* is omitted by  $\aleph$  B D L II 15 Mnn. Italic Orig.

<sup>2</sup> A B D G U A: *ος* instead of *ο*.

<sup>3</sup>  $\aleph$  B L Syr. Orig. omit *δε*.

<sup>4</sup>  $\aleph$  reads *τοπος πολυς* (*much room*) instead of *χορτος πολυς*.

<sup>5</sup>  $\aleph$  B D L: *ως* instead of *ωσει*.

<sup>6</sup>  $\aleph$  reads *τρισχιλιοι* (*three thousand*).

notes *the men* in the restricted meaning of the word; if they alone are indicated, it is not, as *Meyer* alleges, because the women and children were not seated, but because they kept themselves apart and the men only were *counted*. Women and children, in the East, always keep themselves at a respectful distance from the head of the family and his guests.

Ver. 11. "*Then*<sup>1</sup> *Jesus took the loaves, and having given thanks*<sup>2</sup> *he distributed*<sup>3</sup> *them to those who were seated; and likewise of the fishes, as much as they wished.*" This was the solemn moment. Jesus takes in the midst of this multitude the position of the father of a family, as in an ordinary supper, and particularly that of the Passover. He gives thanks, as the father surrounded by his family did for the blessings of God in nature and in the covenant. This moment seems to have been especially impressive to the spectators. It is made almost equally prominent in the four accounts; the multitude and the disciples themselves seem to have had the impression that it was this act of thanksgiving which caused omnipotence to act and which produced the miracle. Comp. ver. 23. After giving thanks, Jesus distributes the food, as the father did at the Paschal-supper. We have rejected from the text the words: *to the disciples and the disciples*, which are omitted by the Alexandrian authorities. It is more probable that there is an interpolation here, borrowed from Matthew. The little detail: *as much as they wished*, forms a contrast to the words of Andrew: "But what are these for so many" (ver. 9).

Vv. 12, 13. "*Then, when they were filled, he says to his disciples: Gather up the broken pieces which remain over, that nothing be lost.* 13. *So they gathered them up, and filled twelve baskets with broken pieces from the five barley loaves which remained over to those who had eaten.*"—In the Synoptics, the order given to the disciples is not mentioned. This order is the triumphant answer to the timid calculations of Philip and Andrew. We can understand, moreover, the close relation which exists in the feeling of Jesus between this word: *that nothing be lost*, and the act of thanksgiving which had produced this abundance. A blessing thus obtained must not be undervalued. Criticism has asked where the twelve baskets came from. The number leads us to suppose that they were the traveling-baskets of the apostles; for they had not set out suddenly, as the crowds had done; or they borrowed them from those standing by. The epithet *τῶν κριθίνων*, *of barley*, is designed to establish the identity of these fragments with the original source, the five loaves of the lad.

Not only is this miracle of the multiplication of the loaves found in all the four Gospels, but several characteristic details are common to the four accounts:—the crowds following Jesus into a desert place, the five loaves and the two fishes, the five thousand men, and the twelve baskets, and especially the solemn moment of the thanksgiving. Besides this, some features are common to three or two Gos-

<sup>1</sup> A B D L: οὐν instead of δε.

<sup>2</sup> N D It. Syr.: ευχαριστήσεν και (he gave thanks and) instead of ευχαριστήσας.

<sup>3</sup> N D F: εδωκεν instead of διεδωκε; T. R.

adds τοις μαθηταις οι δε μαθηται (to the disciples, and the disciples) with 12 Mj. most of the Mnn. It<sup>all</sup>; words which are rejected by N A B L II some Mnn. It<sup>pericope</sup> Vulg. Syr. Cop. Orig.

pels, particularly to Mark and John (the fresh grass, the two hundred denarii). We see that at the foundation of the four accounts there is a fact, the principal features of which were ineffaceably imprinted on the memory of all the witnesses, but whose details had not been equally well observed and retained by all. John's account contains altogether peculiar features which attest the narrative of an eye-witness; thus the part of Philip, of Andrew and of the lad, and the character of the bread (*of barley*). But above all the narrative of John is the one which, as we have seen, makes us penetrate most deeply into the feeling of Jesus and the true spirit of this scene. Modern criticism claims that it was composed by means of materials furnished by the Synoptics, especially by Mark (so *Baur, Hilgenfeld*, and, in some degree, *Weizsäcker* himself, p. 290). But what! these so distinctly marked features, these most exact outlines of John's narrative are only charlatanism! Is it not clear that it is the narrative of the Synoptics which generalizes, in saying *the disciples* instead of Philip, Andrew, etc.,? and that we recognize here a narrative which traditional reproduction had robbed of its "sharp edges"?

According to *Paulus*, there is no need of seeing anything miraculous in this scene. Jesus and the disciples brought out their provisions, generously offering a share of them to their neighbors who followed their example, and, as each gave what he had, every one had enough. *Renan* seems to adopt this explanation of the fact, if not of the text: "Jesus withdrew into the desert. A large number of people followed Him. Thanks to an extreme frugality, the pious company had enough to eat; they believed, of course, that they saw in this a miracle." What, with all this, *Paulus* and *Renan* do not explain is, that so simple a fact could have carried the crowd to such a pitch of excitement that, on that same evening, they attempted to get possession of Jesus in order to proclaim Him King (vv. 14, 15)! *Olshausen* holds an acceleration of the natural process which multiplies the grain of wheat in the bosom of the earth; he thus furnishes matter for *Strauss'* ridicule, who asks whether the law of natural reproduction applies also to broiled fish? *Lange* supposes that it is not the matter itself of the provisions, which was multiplied, but the nutritive power of the molecules!—Either we place ourselves by faith in the region of the supernatural, which is created here on earth by the presence of Jesus, or we refuse to enter that higher sphere. In the latter case, the only part to take is to explain this story with *Strauss* as a mythical product. But what difficulties does not this hypothesis encounter in the perfectly simple, prosaic character of the four narratives, in the mass of small historical details in which they agree, in the authenticity of even one of the writings which contain the story, and finally in the fact that the narrative, before passing into our three Synoptics, had certainly formed a part of the apostolic tradition of which they are independent redactions (see the differences of detail). A fact which was necessarily accomplished with such notoriety could become the subject of a public narrative only on condition of having actually occurred.

## 2. Jesus walking on the water: vv. 14-21.

Vv. 14, 15. "The people therefore, having seen the miracle<sup>1</sup> which He did,<sup>2</sup> said: This is of a truth the prophet that should come into the world. 15. Jesus therefore, knowing that they were about to come and take Him by force to make

<sup>1</sup> B C<sup>o</sup> Cop.: α . . . σημεια (the signs which)  
instead of ο . . . σημειον.

<sup>2</sup> B D Itlerique Syreux omit ο Ιησους, which  
T. R. and 16 Mnn. read.

*Him King,*<sup>1</sup> *withdrew*<sup>2</sup> *again*<sup>3</sup> *into the mountain Himself alone.*" Here is the beginning of the crisis of which we are to see the development even to the end of the chapter. A selection among the adherents of Jesus becomes necessary to purify His work from all political alloy. Jesus had received this multitude with open arms; He had made a feast for them. It was an emblem of that feast which He was procuring for them in a higher realm. By thus giving His bread, He had symbolized that gift of *Himself* which He had just made to mankind. But instead of rising to the hope and desire of such a spiritual banquet, the Galileans occupy their thoughts only with the material miracle, and in their exalted state see in it already the inauguration of a Messianic Kingdom such as they picture to themselves. This is what is expressed by the connection of the participle *having seen*, seen with their eyes, with the verb *ἔλεγον*, *they said*. This exalted state, altogether carnal it is true, is the indisputable proof of what was absolutely extraordinary in that which had just now occurred. The prophet, whom the multitude thought they recognized in Jesus, had been presented in i. 21, 25, as a personage distinct from the Messiah. But it seems from our vv. 14, 15, that many regarded Him as possibly being the Messiah Himself. They imagined probably that, after having been once proclaimed by the people, He would become the Messiah. The plot of which ver. 15 speaks implies the highest degree of enthusiasm on the part of the multitude. John does not tell us how Jesus became aware of it. The word *γινώσκειν*, *knowing*, is explained, according to *Weiss*, by the conversations with these people; according to *Keim*, by certain indications in their mode of action. Certainly all this is possible. But an immediate perception, like that in v. 6, is not to be denied. The participle *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, *he who comes*, is the present of idea; it is an allusion to the prophecy on which the expectation of such a personage rested, Deut. xviii. 18. The term *ἀρπάζειν*, *to seize*, does not allow us to doubt that the plan was to get possession of Jesus, even in spite of Himself, that they might go to Jerusalem and crown Him. The task of Jesus at this moment was a difficult one. If He went away again immediately with His disciples, the commotion instead of being quieted, would be in danger of extending widely in Galilee. If He remained there with His disciples, they might be infected by the contagion of this carnal enthusiasm which would find only too much sympathy in their hearts. It might even be asked whether some one among them, Judas for example, did not secretly direct the plot (vv. 70, 71). It was necessary, therefore, to take measures speedily: First of all, Jesus bestirs Himself to send back His disciples to the other side of the sea, in order to break all immediate connection between them and the multitude. Thus is the singular expression of Matthew (xiv. 22) and Mark (vi. 45) explained: "He straightway *constrained* His disciples to enter into the boat and to go before Him to the other side, till He should send the

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  γενῆς καὶ ἀναδεικνύει βασιλεῖα instead of ἵνα ποιῆσ. αὐτ. βασ.

<sup>2</sup>  $\aleph$  Ἰταλῆ Syr<sup>sup</sup> read φεύγει (*flee*) instead of ἀνεχώρησε.

<sup>3</sup> Πάλιν, *again*, (after ἀνεχώρησε) is read in T. R. with  $\aleph$  A B D K L  $\Delta$  It. Vulg. Syr<sup>sup</sup>; omitted in 10 Mj. Syr<sup>sup</sup> Cop.

multitudes away." This term *constrain*, which is not suggested by anything in the Synoptical narrative, is explained only by the fact which John has just related (vv. 14, 15). Perhaps most of the apostles were ignorant of the true reason of this step which was so suddenly taken by Jesus. After this, Jesus calms and dismisses the multitude, which scatters itself through the neighboring region. Matthew and Mark also say: "*And having sent the multitudes away*, He withdrew to the mountain, apart, to pray." This moment in their narrative evidently coincides with the end of our ver. 15. After this only a part of the multitude—undoubtedly, the most excited part—remained on the spot (comp. ver. 22). The reading *φείγεται*, *flees*, of the Sinaitic MS., which is adopted by *Tischendorf*, is absurd, especially with *πάλιν*, *again*. This last word which is rejected by some Byzantine MSS. is to be retained. It contains an allusion to *ἀνῆλθε*, *he went up* (ver. 3), which was not understood by certain copyists. We must conclude from this that Jesus had approached the shore for the repast, which is in conformity with the Synoptics: *He went forth*, *He received them*; and now He returns to the heights whither He had at first gone with His disciples. *Ἀντὸς μόνος*, *Himself alone*, is in exact contrast to the words of ver. 3: *with His disciples*. *Weiss* also places the *πάλιν*, *again*, in connection with ver. 3, but without holding that Jesus had *descended* for the multiplication of the loaves. The meaning would thus be: "He went up to a still higher point." He supports his view by the: *they descended* (ver. 16), which, according to him, proves that the whole preceding scene had taken place on the height. This reason is of no value (see ver. 16), and to *go up again* is not equivalent to *go up higher*.

Vv. 16-18. "*When the evening was come, his disciples went down to the sea-shore*; 17 *and having entered into the boat, they were crossing<sup>1</sup> the sea towards Capernaum*; and it was already dark<sup>2</sup> and Jesus had not<sup>3</sup> come to them. And the sea was agitated by a strong wind." The word *went down* does not imply that they were still on the heights where they had spent the first part of the day with Jesus, but only (see the *πάλιν* of ver. 15) that the place where the miracle occurred was situated above the shore properly so called. What order had Jesus given His disciples before leaving them? According to the Synoptics, that they should embark for the other side of the sea. This is likewise implied by the narrative of John; for the supposition is inadmissible that they would have embarked, as is related in ver. 17, leaving Jesus alone on the eastern shore, if He had not made known to them His will in this regard. They even hesitate, as we see from vv. 16, 17, to execute this command; they wait for this until the last light of the day. But how can we explain the end of ver. 17? These last words seem to say that they were expecting Jesus, as if He had had the intention of rejoining them (a view which is rendered more probable by the reading *οὐπω*, *not yet*, of the Alexandrian authorities). But this would be in contradiction to the order to depart which He must have given them. It has

<sup>1</sup> *ἐρχονται* instead of *ἤρχοντο*.

<sup>2</sup> *Ἔ B D L 5 Mm. Iptérique Cop. read οὐπω*

<sup>3</sup> *Ἔ D 1 Mm. κατελαβεν δε αυτους η σκοτια* instead of *ουκ*.  
instead of *κ. σκοτ. ήδη εγεγ.*

been held that the words: *He had not yet rejoined them*, were written only from the standpoint of that which really happened later, when Jesus came to them miraculously on the water;—but this sense seems quite unnatural. I think it is more simple to suppose that, inasmuch as the direction from Bethsaida Julias to Capernaum is nearly parallel with that of the northern shore of the lake, Jesus had appointed for them a meeting-place at some point on that side, at the mouth of the Jordan, for example, where he counted upon joining them again. If not, it only remains to hold with *Weiss* that the pluperfects (*the night had already come; Jesus had not rejoined them*) refer, not to the moment when the disciples were already on the sea, but to that when they embarked. But it is difficult to reconcile the imperfect *ἤρχοντο*, literally *they were coming*, with this meaning. It would be necessary in that case to suppose that in vv. 17, 18 John wished only to bring together the different grounds of anxiety which weighed upon the disciples; the night which prevented them from making their course on the water, the absence of Jesus and the violence of the tempest. Is not this rather an expedient than an explanation?

Vv. 19–21. “*When, therefore, they had gone about five and twenty or thirty furlongs, they see Jesus walking on the sea, and drawing near to the boat, and they were afraid.* 20. *But he says to them: It is I, be not afraid.* 21. *And as they were willing<sup>1</sup> to receive him into the boat, immediately the boat reached the point of the shore where they were going.*” There was no other means by which Jesus could rejoin His disciples, before their arrival at Capernaum, but the one which He employs, ver. 19. They were now in the middle of the sea. In its broadest part, the lake of Genesareth was, as Josephus, (*Bell. Jud.*, iii., 10, 7) says, forty stadia, nearly two leagues in width. If the expression of Matthew: “in the midst of the sea,” is taken as an indication of distance (which appears to me doubtful), this detail accords with John’s indication: twenty-five or thirty stadia. The present *they see* indicates the suddenness of the appearance of Jesus; the emotion of fear which the disciples experience, and which is more fully set forth in the Synoptics, does not allow the words *ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης on the sea-shore*. They think that they see a spectre approaching them. Jesus’ words: *It is I, be not afraid*, must have made a very profound impression on the disciples, for it is reported in the same words identically in the four narratives. The imperfect *ἠθέλον* (literally: *they wished*), ver. 21, appears to imply that Jesus did not enter into the boat: “*They were willing to receive Him; but immediately they found themselves at the shore.*” There would thus be a contradiction of Mark and Matthew, according to whom Jesus really entered the boat, in Matthew after the episode of St. Peter. Chrysostom thinks himself obliged to infer from this difference that John was here relating another event than that spoken of by Matthew and Mark. But the close relation between this miracle and the multiplication of the loaves in the three Gospels, as well as the general

<sup>1</sup> *κ*: ἤλθον (*they came*) instead of ἠθέλον.

similarity of the three accounts, do not permit us to accept this solution. *J. D. Michaelis* supposed that, instead of ἦθελον, ἦλθον must be read, which would solve the difficulty: *they came*; they drew near Him with the boat to receive Him. And, a singular circumstance, the *Sinaitic MS.* presents precisely the reading which was conjectured by this scholar. But it has too much the appearance of a correction to deserve confidence. Besides, Jesus moved so freely upon the waters that the boat had no need to come near to Him. *Beza* and many exegetes after him think that the verb *were willing*, here simply adds to the act of receiving, the notion of eagerness, comp. Luke xx. 46; Col. ii. 18. And *Tholuck* has given greater probability to this meaning by contrasting the words *were willing*, as thus understood, with φοβήθησαν, *they were afraid*: they were afraid at the first moment, but now they received him *willingly*. There is one thing opposed to this explanation: it is that John has written the imperfect, *they were wishing*, which denotes incomplete action, and not the aorist, *they wished*, which would indicate an action completed (i. 44). On the other hand, there is little probability that John could have meant to say, in contradiction to the Synoptics, that Jesus did not really enter the boat, as *Meyer* thinks. In that case, must he not have said, instead of καὶ εὐθέως, *and immediately*, ἀλλ' εὐθέως, *but immediately*? The meaning of John's narrative would be indeed that the sudden arrival at the shore prevented the execution of the disciples' purpose. As to ourselves, the relation between the two clauses of ver. 21, standing thus in juxtaposition, seems to us to be similar to that which we have already observed elsewhere in John (v. 17). It is a logical relation, which we express by means of a conjunction: "*At the moment when they were eager to receive Him, the boat came to shore.*" The moment of the entrance of Jesus into the boat was thus that of the arrival. The thing took place so rapidly that the disciples themselves did not understand precisely the way in which it occurred. Ver. 33 of Matt. and ver. 51 of Mark must be placed at the moment of disembarking. One can scarcely imagine, indeed, that, after an act of power so magnificent and so kingly as Jesus' walking on the waters, He should have seated Himself in the boat, and the voyage should have been laboriously continued by the stroke of the oar? At the moment when Jesus set His foot on the boat, He communicated to it, as He had just done for Peter, the force victorious over gravity and space, which had just been so strikingly displayed in His own person. The words καὶ εὐθέως, *and immediately*, compared with the distance of ten or fifteen stadia (thirty to forty-five minutes) which yet separated them from the shore, allow no other explanation.

Such is the real sovereignty which Jesus opposes to the political royalty that fleshly-minded Israel designed to lay upon Him. He gives Himself to His own as the one who reigns over a vaster domain, over all the forces of nature, and who can, one day, free Himself and free them from the burden of this mortal body. If the multiplication of the loaves was the prelude of the offering which He would make of His flesh for the nourishment of the world,—if, in this terrible night of darkness, tempest and separation, they have experienced as it were the foretaste of an approaching

more sorrowful separation, in this unexpected and triumphant return across the heaving waves, Jesus, as it were, prefigured His resurrection by means of which He will be restored to them and that triumphant ascension in which He will one day give the Church itself a share, when, raising it with Himself, through the breath of His Spirit, He will bring it even to the heavenly places.

When we bear in mind that every voluntary movement which is effected by our body, every impulse which we communicate to a body which we throw into the air, is—undoubtedly not an abolishing of the law of gravitation, but—a victory which we gain momentarily over that law through the intervention of a force superior to it, namely, that of the will, we can understand that matter, being itself the work of the Divine will, remains always open to this essentially supernatural power. There is nothing therefore to prevent the Divine breath from being able, in a given condition, to free the human body for a time from the power of gravity. *Reuss* finds that this miracle “places Jesus outside of and above humanity,” and that, if it is real, it must no longer be said that the Lord divested Himself of His divine attributes. But to be raised above the law of gravity is less than to be wrested from death. Would the resurrection of Jesus, according to *Reuss*, prove that He was not a man? That of Lazarus, that he was not a man? The question of the *κένωσις* has absolutely nothing to do with this matter.

## II.—*The Discourses*: vv. 22–65.

This section contains, first an historical introduction (vv. 22–24), then a series of conversations and discourses (vv. 25–65).

Vv. 22–24. “*On the morrow, the multitude who stood on the other side of the sea and who had seen<sup>1</sup> that there was no other boat there but one,<sup>2</sup> that into which the disciples had entered, and that Jesus entered not<sup>3</sup> with his disciples into this boat,<sup>4</sup> but that his disciples went away<sup>5</sup> alone—23 but<sup>6</sup> there came other boats<sup>7</sup> from Tiberias near to the place where they had eaten the bread<sup>8</sup> after the Lord had given thanks—24 when the multitude therefore saw<sup>9</sup> that Jesus was not there, neither his disciples, they themselves<sup>10</sup> got into the boats,<sup>11</sup> and came to Capernaum, seeking Jesus.*”—The carnal fanaticism of the multitude had constrained Jesus to separate His disciples from them and to

<sup>1</sup> T. R. reads *ἰδῶν* with Γ Δ Α and 9 other Mj. most Mnn. Syrcut; A B L Itptique Syrch: *εἶδον*, and N D It<sup>13</sup>q; *εἶδεν*.

<sup>2</sup> A B L Itptique omit the words: *εκεῖνον εἰς ὃ ἐνεβησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτου*, which are read by N D Γ Δ Α and 9 other Mj. Mnn. Syr. (but with many variants).

<sup>3</sup> Instead of *συνεισηλθε*, N reads *συνελήλυθε*.

<sup>4</sup> Alex: *πλοῖον* instead of *πλοιαριῶν*.

<sup>5</sup> N omits *ἀπηλθον*.

<sup>6</sup> B D L Θ omit *δε*.

<sup>7</sup> N: *ἐπελθόντων οὐν τῶν πλοίων*. D b Syrcut: *ἄλλων πλοιαριῶν ἐλθόντων*.

<sup>8</sup> N: *ἐκ Τιβεριᾶδος ἐγγὺς οὐσης ὁπου καὶ*

*εφαγον ἄρτον* (from Tiberias which is near the place where they had eaten bread).

<sup>9</sup> N καὶ ἰδόντες instead of *ὅτε οὐν εἶδεν*.

<sup>10</sup> T. R. reads *καὶ αὐτοὶ* with U Γ some Mnn.; N S Itptique Syr. omit these two words; the B other Mj. and the greater part of the Mnn. read *αὐτοὶ*.

<sup>11</sup> N: *εἰς τὸ πλοῖον* instead of the plural *πλοῖα* or *πλοιαρία* between which the other Mj. are divided.—The following is the translation of the entire text of N: “*On the next day, the multitude which stood on the other side of the sea saw that there was no other boat there than that into which the disciples of Jesus had entered, and that Jesus went not with them into*

separate Himself from the disciples very suddenly. He had now rejoined them, and the multitude set itself to seek after Him, still in the same spirit. The long and difficult sentence, vv. 22-24, has for its aim to bring out this idea: that the sole thought which occupied the minds of this company was that of Jesus (end of ver. 24: *seeking Jesus*). By examining attentively this complicated sentence, we can soon understand its true construction. Everything starts from the condition of the multitude on the following morning (*on the morrow the multitude who stood*, ver. 22), and looks to the resolution taken by them to set out for Capernaum (*they got into the boats*, ver. 24). The cause of this resolution is stated in the two determinative expressions: *ιδῶν, seeing*, ver. 22, and *ὅτε οὖν εἶδεν, when therefore they saw* (ver. 24); then, indirectly, in the parenthesis, ver. 23, designed to explain the *possibility* of this resolution taken by the multitude. In this ver. 23 we find a form analogous to that which we met in i. 10 and ii. 9. It seems that the circumlocutions which characterize this passage are a symbol of the perplexity experienced by the crowd until the moment when the arrival of the boats inspired them with a sudden resolution. The first word: *on the morrow*, has already a bearing upon the last verb of the sentence: *they got into the boats* (ver. 24). The sense of the perfect participle *ὁ ἐστηκώς, who stood there*, is this: "who had remained since the previous evening and *who were still* on the shore at that moment." It seems to me that the article *ὁ* before the participle must serve to limit the idea of the substantive: "the part of the crowd who . . ." They were the most persistent ones. It is very evident that the entire multitude of the preceding day, the five thousand, did not cross the sea in these few boats.—The reading *εἶδον* or *εἶδεν*, adopted by *Tischendorf* (8th ed.), and by the latest commentators (*Weiss, Keil*), has in its favor the most ancient MSS. The reading *ιδῶν, having seen*, is supported by fifteen of the later Mj. (Γ Δ Λ etc.) and by the Curetonian Syriac; it is in my view the true reading. We must give to *ιδῶν* the sense of the pluperfect which is rendered indispensable by the two *ὅτι, that*, which follow: "On the morrow, the multitude who *had seen* that there was only one boat there and that the disciples had gone away in this boat without Jesus."—The limiting expression: *who had seen*, as well as the adverb of time: *on the morrow*, are in logical relation to the final act: *they got into the boats* (ver. 24). The aorist *εἶδεν* or *εἶδον* cannot have the sense of the pluperfect because, as a finite verb, it is necessarily determined by *τῇ ἐπαύριον, on the morrow*; but the expression: "on the morrow the multitude saw (sing. or plur.);" affords no reasonable meaning; for it was not on the day after the miracle, but on the same evening, that the crowds saw that there was only one boat there and that the disciples had entered into it without Jesus. It would be necessary therefore to translate: *had seen*, which the limiting expression *on the morrow* renders impossible. This reading cannot therefore be sustained, unless we take *ἦν, was*, in the sense of *had been*, which is much more inadmissible than our

*the boat, but the disciples only; the boats having then come from Tiberias, which was near the place where they had eaten the bread after the*

*Lord had given thanks, having seen that Jesus was not there, nor His disciples, they entered into the boat and came . . ."*

sense of *ιδών*. The Alexandrian reading *saw* (sing. or plur.) was quite easily introduced by the mistaken idea that the *ὅτε οὖν εἶδεν*, when [the multitude] *saw*, of ver. 24 was the resumption of that of ver. 22, after the parenthesis ver. 23 (an error which is even at the present time found in *Keil*). This, then, is the meaning, The multitude who were standing there had on the preceding evening discovered two things: 1. That there was only one boat there; 2. That the disciples had departed in this boat, and that Jesus had not gone with His disciples (the two *ὅτε* of ver. 22). These two facts duly discovered held them back; for it seemed to follow from them that Jesus, whom they were seeking, must still be on that side of the lake. *Consequently* (*οὖν, therefore*, ver. 24)—that is to say, by reason of the departure of Jesus during the night—when, on the next morning, they saw neither Jesus nor His disciples (who might have come back to seek Him), they took the resolution of crossing the sea, availing themselves of the boats which had arrived in the interval, to endeavor to find Jesus again on the other side. The *ὅτε οὖν εἶδεν*, when *therefore they saw*, of ver. 24, is not, then, by any means a resumption of *ιδών*, *having seen*, ver. 22.<sup>1</sup> It serves to complete it, by indicating a new and even opposite sight. According to ver. 22, indeed, it seemed that Jesus must still be there; according to ver. 24, they discovered that He was no longer there. Hence the resolution to go into the boats. As to the parenthesis (ver. 23), it explains how they were able to think of doing it. The arrival of these boats has occasioned difficulties. Did they come, perhaps, because it was known on the other side that this assemblage was formed in this desert place and needed boats for their return? *Westcott* makes a very probable supposition when he supposes that it was the tempest of the night which had forced them to take refuge under the eastern shore. The words, *that whereinto His disciples had entered*, may be a gloss; yet they have in their favor the *Sinaitic MS.*, and are very suitable. The particular which is so expressly brought to notice: *after that the Lord had given thanks*, and which is not demanded by the context, recalls the vivid impression which that solemn moment had produced on the spectators and the decisive importance attached by them to that act.

The *ἀλλὰ*, ver. 24, does not signify *others*; it is the adversative particle *but*; at least provided the *δέ* of T. R. is not authentic, in which case this *ἀλλὰ* must rather be taken as an adjective (*others*). The particle *καί*, *also*, before, *αἱ τοὶ* would mean: "they, *as well as* the disciples and Jesus Himself." This word, however, is insufficiently supported by U R. The *αἱ τοὶ* makes their persons prominent in contrast to those who had gone away before.<sup>2</sup> They decided at last to do themselves what all the rest had done. The verb so long expected *ἐπέβησαν*, *embarked*, well brings out the final act which ended this long indecision. Thus there are described with an astonishing precision, in this long sentence, all the impressions, fluctuations, various observations of this multitude, up to the point of the decision

<sup>1</sup> One might be tempted to connect *ιδών* closely with *ἐσθκώς*: "which remained there because they had seen that . . . and that thus

Jesus could not have departed."

<sup>2</sup> We have been obliged to render it by *also*.

which brings them to Capernaum, and gives occasion to the conversations of the next day. Let one imagine a Greek writer of Alexandria or of Rome, in the second century, narrating after this fashion! Nowhere, perhaps, does the defective and arbitrary character of the Sinaitic text betray itself as it does in this passage (comp. note 11, p. 14).

Although the idea which is predominant in the discourses, vv. 25-65, appears to be the same as that of chap. v., namely, that of *life*, there is a difference between the teachings contained in these two chapters, which corresponds to that of the two miracles, the application of which they contain. In the healing of the impotent man, it is Jesus who acts; the sick man is receptive. In the repast in chap. vi., the food is simply offered by Jesus; if nutrition is to be accomplished, man must act in order to assimilate it. This is the reason why, while in the discourse of chap. v. it is the *person of Jesus* that comes forward, in the conversations of chap. vi., it is rather the idea of *faith* which predominates. Without finding it necessary, as *Baur* does, to explain the composition of our Gospel by a systematic process, we may yet hold that John, in gathering up his recollections, was struck by the correlation between these two testimonies, which makes one the complement of the other, and that he designedly brought them together as presenting the complete description of the relation between divine and human agency in salvation.

Four phases can be distinguished in this conversation, determined in each instance by a manifestation of a portion of the hearers. The first (vv. 25-40) is brought on by a *question* of the Jews (*εἶπον αὐτῷ, they said to him*). The second (vv. 41-51) results from a serious *dissatisfaction* which manifests itself (*ἐγόγγυζον, they murmured*). The third (vv. 52-59) is marked by an *altercation* which arises among the hearers themselves (*ἐμάχοντο, they strove among themselves*). The last (vv. 60-65) is called forth by a *declaration* of the larger part of the earlier Galilean believers, who announce to Jesus their rupture with Him.—Did all these conversations take place in the synagogue? This has little probability. Ver. 25 would not lead us to suppose it. The remark of ver. 59 may be referred to the last phases only.

### 1. Vv. 25-40.

This first phase is made up of four brief dialogues, each including a question of the Jews and an answer of Jesus. The last of these answers is more fully developed; Jesus expresses in it, with restrained emotion, the impressions with which the condition of His hearers filled His soul.

1. Vv. 25-27. The contrast between the food which perishes and that which abides.

Vv. 25, 26. "And having found him on the other side of the sea, they said unto him: Rabbi, when camest thou<sup>1</sup> hither? 26. Jesus answered them and said: Verily, verily, I say unto you, You seek<sup>2</sup> me, not because you saw signs,<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Instead of γεγονας,  $\aleph$  reads ηλθες, D ελληνουθας.

<sup>2</sup>  $\aleph$  omits ζητετε με (you seek me).

<sup>3</sup> D I<sup>244</sup> add και τερατα (derived from iv. 48).

but because you did eat of those loaves and were filled."—We have seen that the motive for the action of the multitude was the seeking for Jesus; this is recalled to mind by the first words of this passage: "*And having found him.*" The question: *when* (not: *how*) *camest thou?* arises from the fact that they think it impossible that Jesus had made the journey on foot over the road which separates Bethsaida Julias from Capernaum (two to three leagues). The presence of Jesus produces on them the effect of an apparition. He replies, as on every occasion when He is questioned in the way of curiosity, not to the question of the interlocutor, but to the feeling which dictates it. Comp. ii. 4; iii. 3, etc. He unveils to these Jews what is false and fleshly in their way of seeking Him. As there is here a revelation of their inward feelings, of which they were themselves unconscious, He uses the emphatic affirmation, *amen, amen*. Jesus contrasts here with the false and vain seeking after His person, which aims only at the satisfaction of the earthly man (ver. 26), that salutary seeking which tends to fill the wants of the spiritual man (ver. 27). His miracles were the visible signs of the blessings of salvation which He brings to mankind. It will be necessary, therefore, not to rest in the material relief which they procure; it will be necessary to rise by their means to the desire of the superior gifts of which they are the pledge and the image; it will be necessary, before and above all, to believe on Him whom God points out to the world by giving to Him to do such works. We see how necessary it is to avoid translating the word *σημεῖα*, *signs*, here by *miracles* (*Ostervald, Arnaud, Rilliet*). It is precisely on the meaning *signs* that the whole force of this saying depends. The multitudes interpreted the multiplication of the loaves as the beginning of a series of wonders of the *same nature*, the inauguration of an era of miracles more and more brilliant and satisfying to the flesh. "Instead of seeing," as *Lange* says, "in the bread the sign, they had seen in the sign only the bread." This gross want of understanding is what gives to their search for Jesus a false, earthly, sensual, animal character. This tendency it is which Jesus points out to them from the very first word of the conversation, and particularly by the expression which betrays a sort of disgust: *and because you were filled*. What a difference between these people, who come with their gross aspirations, their earthly appetites, and the spiritual Israel which the Old Testament was intended to prepare and which cries out: "My soul thirsts after thee, oh living God!" This Israel would say to Him who multiplied the loaves: Give us more still! Do to-day for our hearts what thou didst yesterday for our bodies! The plural, *signs*, refers either to the two miracles related in the former part of the chapter, or rather to the miracles in general, which had been no better understood by the multitudes than the one of multiplying the loaves. We have rendered the article *τῶν* before *ἄρτων* by the demonstrative pronoun: "*those loaves*," because the word *the* contains an evident allusion to the loaves of the preceding day.

Ver. 27. "Work to obtain, not the food<sup>1</sup> which perishes, but the food which

<sup>1</sup> places *μη* after the first *βρωσιν* and with some Mss. rejects the second *βρωσιν*.

endures to eternal life, that which the Son of man shall give<sup>1</sup> unto you; for him hath the Father, God, sealed."—Behold now the true way in which Jesus would be sought. It follows, indeed, from the contrast between ἐργάζεσθε, work, and ζητεῖτε, you seek me (ver. 26), that the work to which He exhorts His hearers is none other than the seeking for His person with a spiritual aim. The repast of the preceding evening had sustained them for that day. But, when the morning came, were they not obliged to eat again? That bread, miraculous as it was, had, thus, been only a temporary nourishment. What purpose would the renewal of a similar gift on this day have served? To this transient food Jesus opposes that which abides inherent in the human person as a permanent principle of life and action. The term ἐργάζεσθαι, to work, signifies here: to obtain by one's labor (see the examples drawn from classical Greek, in Meyer).—The words: unto eternal life, designate either the effect immediately produced (Reuss) or the final limit (even to); see at iv. 14. The future, shall give, is certainly the true reading; it is designed to raise the minds of the hearers to the nourishment of a higher nature which Jesus brings to the world, and of which the multiplied loaves were only the type and promise. This notion of giving seems at the first glance in contradiction to the order to work (ἐργάζεσθε). But the work by which man procures for himself this truly life-giving food does not consist in creating it, but in making himself fit to receive it, by believing on the divine messenger who brings it to him. The human work would remain useless, without the divine gift, as also the divine gift remains inefficacious without the internal work by means of which the man appropriates it to himself. The name Son of man is also in connection with the thought developed afterwards, that Jesus is Himself this celestial food; for if it is placed within the reach of faith, it is by virtue of the incarnation (vv. 33, 38, 50, 58). The for relates to the word will give. Jesus is sealed, that is, personally pointed out to the world by His miracles in general, and more particularly by that of the preceding day; as the one who brings this life-giving bread to the earth and who gives it. This is the explanation, given by Jesus Himself, of the term signs. His miracles are the authentic signs of the salvation with which He is intrusted, in its different aspects. The word ὁ θεός, God, is placed at the end of the sentence to set forth distinctly the person of Him who, as possessor of supreme authority, has alone the power and the right to give such certifications.

The first dialogue has contrasted and characterized in an altogether general way the two kinds of good which may be sought from Jesus.

2. Vv. 28, 29. The brief dialogue which follows bears upon the true means of obtaining this really desirable good, the food which abides; it is the true mode of ἐργάζεσθαι (working).

Vv. 28, 29. "They said therefore<sup>2</sup> to Him: What must we do,<sup>3</sup> to do the works of God? 29. Jesus answered and said to them: This is the work of God, that you believe<sup>4</sup> on Him whom He has sent." As Jesus had said: "Labor

<sup>1</sup> D Italic read διδωσιν υμιν (gives you) instead of υμιν δωσει.

<sup>2</sup> A Syr. omit ουν (therefore).

<sup>3</sup> C, with some Mss. only: ποιουμεν (do).

<sup>4</sup> N A B L T: πιστευητε instead of πιστευσητε.

(literally, *work*),” the hearers, believing that they entered into His thought, ask Him: How work? In what do these works to be done for obtaining the food which Thou offerest consist? They call them the *works of God*, as being demanded by God as the condition of this gift. They start herein from the legal point of view, and see in these works to be done a work for which the miraculous food is the payment. It is impossible for me to see that there can be anything “grotesque” or improbable in this answer of the Jews (*Reuss*). It corresponds with many questions of the same kind in the Synoptics. (Matt. xix. 16; Luke x. 25, etc.) Jesus, in His turn, enters into this idea of works to be done; only He reduces them all to a single one: *the work*, in contrast to *the works* (ver. 28). This work is faith in Him; in other terms: the gift of God is to be, not deserved, but simply accepted. Faith in Him whom God sends to communicate it is the sole condition for receiving it. It is evident that, in this context, the genitive τοῦ θεοῦ, *of God*, designates, not the *author* of the work (*Augustine*), but the one with reference to whom it is done: the question is of the work which God *requires*. What is called Paulinism is implied in this answer, which may be called the point of union between Paul and James. *Faith* is really a work, *the highest work*, for by it man gives himself, and a free being cannot *do* anything greater than to give himself. It is in this sense that James opposes *work* to a faith which is only a dead intellectual belief; as it is in an analogous sense, that St. Paul opposes *faith* to works of mere observance. The living faith of Paul is, at the foundation, the living work of James, according to that sovereign formula of Jesus: “*This is the work of God, that ye believe.*” With the discussion of the true human work which leads to the possession of the heavenly gift is connected a new one on the *way* to the attaining of faith. The Jews think that in order to this end, there is need for them of new miracles. Jesus declares to them that the true sign is present; it is Himself.

3. Vv. 30–33. The way to reach faith.

Vv. 30, 31. “*Then they said to Him: What sign dost thou then, that we may see, and believe in thee? What work dost thou do? 31. Our fathers ate the manna in the wilderness, according as it is written: He gave them bread from heaven to eat.*” It is difficult to imagine these words on the lips of people who had been present the day before at the multiplying of the loaves. *B. Bauer* saw herein a proof of the non-authenticity of the narrative. *Schweizer* concluded from it that the whole preceding passage was interpolated. *Grotius* and others think that these interlocutors who speak thus had not been present at the scene of the preceding day. *De Wette* and *Weiss* suppose that this part of the conversation is located here out of its true place. *Lücke*, *Luthardt*, *Meyer* find here the proof of the psychological truth that the natural man is insatiable in respect to wonders. *Riggenbach*, and up to a certain point *Weiss*, recall the scarcely apparent way in which the multiplying of the loaves had been accomplished. The creative operation had not been seen. Others think that Jesus’ hearers contrast this quite ordinary bread which Jesus had given them with the manna, manifestly falling every morning *from heaven*, which Moses

gave to their fathers, and that they find the first of these miracles far inferior to the second. But, however true these remarks may be, it must be confessed that they do not yet explain such questions as these: "What sign doest Thou? What workest Thou?" addressed to a man who had just done such a miracle and presented by people who had, the day before, wished to proclaim Him King. It is necessary, I think, to take account of a circumstance strongly brought out by *Weiss* and *Keil*: the dissatisfaction felt by this multitude in consequence of the absolute refusal of Jesus to consent to the great Messianic demonstration which they had planned. And, strange fact! while refusing to be proclaimed King and Messiah, He yet claimed to be recognized as the supreme messenger of God, as the object of faith, of a faith which dispensed with all the works prescribed by the law and even with every work; as the one who brought from heaven to men an imperishable life. Was the miracle wrought on the level with such pretensions? No, it did not even raise Jesus to the height of Moses, above whom He seemed nevertheless to place Himself by arrogating such a part to Himself! It is not therefore altogether without reason that they bring out the contrast between the scarcely apparent miracle of the day before and the magnificent display of power of which Moses had been the instrument before the people during forty years. *Redemptor prior descendere fecit pro iis manna; sic et Redemptor posterior descendere faciet manna*, said the Rabbis (see *Lightfoot* and *Wetstein*). This, at least, is what would have been expected of Him to justify pretensions such as His! The words quoted by the Jews are found in Ps. lxxviii. 24, 25. Comp. Exod. xvi. 4, 15. The verb *has given* has for its subject *God*. The expression "*from heaven*" denotes, in their mouth, only the miraculous *origin* of the divine gift, while Jesus, in His answer, thinks above all of its *essence*:

Vv. 32, 33. "*Jesus therefore said to them: Verily, verily, I say unto you: Moses did not give<sup>1</sup> you the bread from heaven; but my Father gives you the bread from heaven, the true bread; 33 for the bread of God is that which comes down from heaven, and gives life to the world.*" Until this point, the thought of the auditors seemed to move in accord with that of Jesus, but this was due to an ambiguity: Jesus made announcement of a bread of a higher nature, and the Jews accepted the offer willingly, but on the condition that this food should be not only miraculous in its origin, but also of a material nature, like the manna, an ambrosia falling from heaven. Jesus now gives an explanation which brings to light the opposition between His thought and theirs. The formula *amen, amen* foreshadows this contrast in the two points of view. The perfect *δέδωκεν* must be preferred to the aorist, which seems to have been introduced from ver. 31. The sense of the perfect is this: "The gift of the heavenly bread is not a thing which Moses accomplished for your fathers and yourselves." The predominant contrast is not that of the two objects (*Keil*), but that of the two

<sup>1</sup> Instead of *δέδωκεν* which is read by 15 Mj. (among them **κ**) almost all the Mm. and Orig., *εδωκεν* is read by B D L.

subjects. If they are in possession of the true bread from heaven, it is not by the act of Moses, it is by the gift of the Father who sends it to them at this very moment. This is what is indicated by the present *δίδοσι*, *gives*, which already affords a suggestion of what Jesus is about to say, namely, that it is God who makes this gift in His person. The word *τὸν ἀληθινόν*, *the true*, is added at the end of the sentence in order to place the spiritual, divine *essence* of this bread in contrast with such a gift as that of the manna, which, although miraculous in its origin, was material in its nature. The limiting words *from heaven* belong here and in the following verse, not to the verb *has given* (in opposition to Meyer)—but as in Ps. lxxviii. 24, to the substantive *bread*. The position of this limiting word in the Greek indicates this, and it is on the idea of *bread from heaven* that the discussion turns.

Ver. 33 applies this idea of true *bread from heaven*, to Jesus, but for the moment in obscure words. The difficulty of this verse is that the words *descending from heaven*, which are the paraphrase of the term *bread from heaven*, should be logically joined to the subject which is to be defined, and not to the attribute which contains the definition. It seems that it should be: "For the true *bread from heaven* is that which descends *from God*, from God Himself." I formerly tried to resolve this difficulty by applying the participle *ὁ καταβαίνων*, the *descending*, not to the bread, but to Jesus himself: "He who descends." Meyer and Weiss object that in that case *ὁ καταβάς*, "He who descended," would be necessary. Ver. 50 answers this objection. Nevertheless, I acknowledge that the ellipsis of *ὁ ἄρτος* (*the bread*) is more natural, although the idea of *descending* applies more easily to a person than to a thing (comp. ver. 38). Weiss himself has recourse to a very far-fetched explanation: it is to make *ὁ ἄρτος τοῦ θεοῦ*, *the bread of God*, the predicate of the two following participles: "The bread which descends from heaven and gives life to the world, is that which is the true bread of God." What seems more simple is to understand with Keil: "For the bread which God Himself gives (ver. 32) is the only bread which truly descends from heaven and can give life." Jesus thus opposes the true heaven, that is, the glorious life of God, to the local heaven from which, according to the opinion of His hearers, the manna descended. The expression *τῷ κόσμῳ*, *to the world*, is opposed to the theocratic particularism which boasted itself especially in the great national miracle—that of the manna. The greatness of the heavenly gift, as Jesus presents it here, no longer allows a national and particular destination. In proportion as Jesus sees the people refusing to follow Him in the spiritual sphere into which He wished to elevate them, He is led to turn his eyes towards mankind for whom He has come. The fourth part of the conversation (vv. 34–40) reveals completely the rupture which has just taken place between the thought of the people and that of Jesus.

4. Vv. 34–40. The two classes of hearers, the unbelievers and the believers.

Vv. 34, 35. "They said therefore to him: Lord, evermore give us this bread.

35. But<sup>1</sup> Jesus said to them: *I am the bread of life; he that comes to me shall never hunger,<sup>2</sup> and he that believes on me shall never thirst.*"<sup>2</sup> The Jews, still regarding the heavenly bread as a wonderful, but material food, declare themselves ready to follow Jesus always, if He will procure for them this food; and that daily. The *evermore* undoubtedly alludes to the gift of the manna which was renewed every morning. *This bread*: this food far higher than the manna itself. Here is the highest point of their carnal exaltation. But it is also the moment when Jesus breaks with them decidedly. Up to this moment, the questions and answers were directly connected with each other, and the particle *οὖν*, *therefore*, had indicated continuous progress. But the particle *δέ* of ver. 35, which seems to me to be the true reading, marks a sudden change in the course of the conversation; the *ἀλλά*, *but*, of ver. 36 will mark the complete rupture.

The words: "*I am . . .*," are the categorical answer to the: *Give us*, of the Jews: "What you ask is accomplished: this bread is Myself. It only remains to feed on it; and the means for this end is simply to come to me with a soul which hungers and thirsts for salvation." Jesus finally explains His expression in ver. 27. *The food which endures* of which He there speaks is Himself; the work to be done in order to obtain it is faith in Him. The expression *bread of life* can signify: the bread which communicates life, but perhaps the relation between these two notions of bread and life is still closer. The true life, which is in God Himself, "*the eternal life which was in the beginning with the Father*" (1 John i. 2), was incarnated in this visible being; it became in Him capable of being laid hold of, touched, tasted. But in order that this food may give us life, there must be action on our part: *coming* and *believing*. These two terms are not exactly synonymous: the first denotes the act of approaching Christ with the seriousness of a heart with a sense of sin; the second, the confiding eagerness with which this furnished heart takes possession of the heavenly food in Him. The force of the negative *οὐ μή* can be rendered by: *It is not to be feared that ever . . .* The *οὐ πάποτε*, *never*, is the answer to the *πάντοτε*, *evermore*, of ver. 34. The parallelism of the two clauses betrays a certain exaltation of feeling produced by the greatness of the fact declared. The figure of *drinking* does not properly suit the context: it is added to that of *eating*, perhaps because Jesus is thinking of the Passover supper. In the sequel of the discourse, we shall see that these two figurative expressions take each of them a meaning continually more distinct (vv. 53-57). And even here they are not absolutely identical. Hunger represents rather the feeling of weakness, of moral powerlessness; thirst, that of the sufferings of the conscience and the heart. Taken together, they express the deep uneasiness which drives the sinner to Jesus Christ. The appeasing of the thirst therefore refers rather to the peace; that of the hunger, to the new strength which the believer receives.

<sup>1</sup> Instead of *δέ* which A Δ Λ and 11 Mjj. read, *οὖν* is read in **Ξ D F** some Mnn. Sah.; B L T I<sup>104</sup> Syr. omit *δέ* and *οὖν*.

<sup>2</sup> The MSS. read *πειρασθῶν—σεί, διψήσῶν ἢ—σεί.*

*Coming, believing*: these, then, are the conditions. But, adds Jesus with grief, it is precisely these conditions which are wanting in you.

Ver. 36. "But I said unto you: *you have seen me,*<sup>1</sup> and yet you do not believe." They had asked to see in order to believe (ver. 30). But this condition was long since fulfilled: they have seen Him in all His greatness and goodness, as much as was necessary to believe, and yet the effect is not produced: *you do not believe*. Jesus has the right to draw this conclusion even from their request. No doubt they had faith enough to ask Him for the miraculous bread, but not to recognize Himself as the heavenly bread. This proves that they are still strangers to the spiritual needs which might lead them to Him, and to the work which He came to accomplish here on earth. This is what is signified to an ear as sensitive as that of Jesus by the prayer: "Give us," while they already possess Him Himself. In this way they end by revealing their moral stupidity. Comp. two equally rapid and decisive judgments, the one at Jerusalem (ii. 19), the other at Nazareth (Luke iv. 23).

To what earlier saying does Jesus allude in the expression: "I said unto you?" The words in iv. 48 may be thought of, in which the relation between the two ideas of *seeing and believing* is altogether different. The declaration of v. 37, of which *de Wette*, *Lücke*, and *Reuss*, think, has also a very different meaning, and besides it was uttered in Judea. There is nothing here which troubles *Reuss*. On the contrary, in his view this only proves more evidently this fact: "That in the mind of the redactor all these discourses are addressed to one and the same public, the readers of the book." In order that this conclusion should be well founded, it would be necessary that no other more exact reference should present itself. Others suppose that Jesus cites a saying which John has not mentioned; but, in that case, to what purpose recall it expressly by the formula of quotation: *I said to you?* *Meyer* proposes to translate *εἶπον ὑμῖν* by: *dictum velim*, "regard it as said." This sense is unexampled in the New Testament. *Brückner* thinks that Jesus is calling to mind His whole teaching in general. But this expression indicates a positive citation. Jesus quotes Himself here, as He often quotes the Old Testament, according to the spirit rather than according to the letter. On the arrival of the multitude, He had said to them: "You have seen signs, and yet you seek Me only for the renewal of material satisfaction and not because of Myself." It is this charge of ver. 26 which He repeats here in a little different form: "You have seen Me," corresponds with: "you have seen signs;" and "you do not believe," with "you seek Me only for the sake of the flesh and not that your soul may be satisfied." To say to Him: "Give us," when one has Him as present—was not this to refuse to believe in Him as the true gift of God? The reading of the *Sinaitic* and *Alexandrian* MSS.: *you have seen* (without *me*, *me*), undoubtedly sets forth better the contrast between *seeing* and *believing*. The *Alexandrian* MS. itself, however, replaces the pronoun after *πιστεύετε* (*moi*), and in the entire context it is the

<sup>1</sup> N A It<sup>all</sup>q Syr<sup>ew</sup> omit *me*.

person of Jesus which plays the chief part. The two *kai . . . kai* (*and . . . and*), are untranslatable: they forcibly bring out the moral contrast between the two facts which they so closely bring together.

Between this word of condemnation and the calm and solemn declaration of the following verses (37-40), there is a significant *asyndeton*. This omission of any connecting particle indicates a moment of silence and profound meditation. Jesus had received a signal from His Father; in the joy of His heart, He had given a feast to all this people; He had made for them a miraculous Passover. And these dull hearts have not understood it at all. They ask again for bread, the earth still and nothing but the earth, while He had desired, by means of this figurative repast, to offer them *life*, to open to them heaven! In the presence of this failure, which for Him is the prelude of the grand national catastrophe, the rejection of the Messiah, Jesus communes with Himself; then He continues: "It is in vain that you do not believe! My work remains, nevertheless, the Father's work; it will be accomplished without you, since it must be; and in the fact of your exclusion nothing can be laid to my charge; for I limit myself to fulfilling in a docile way, at each moment, the instructions of my Father!" Thus the painful check which He has just experienced does not shake His faith, He rises to the contemplation of the assured success of His work in the hearts which His Father will give Him; and by protesting His perfect submissiveness to the plan of the Father, He lays upon the unbelievers themselves the blame of their rejection, and thus addresses to their consciences the last appeal.

Vv. 37, 38. "*All that which the Father gives me shall come unto me; and him who comes to me I will in no wise cast out;*<sup>1</sup> *38 for I am come down from heaven*<sup>2</sup> *to do,*<sup>3</sup> *not my own will, but the will of him who sent me."*<sup>4</sup> By the words: *All that which the Father gives me*, Jesus strongly contrasts the believers of all times with these men to whom He had just said: You do not believe! The neuter *πάν ὃ*, *all that which*, indicates a definite whole in which human unbelief will be unable to make any breach, a whole which will appear complete at the end of the work. The extent of this *πάν*, *all*, depends on an act of the Father designated here by the term *give*, and later by *teach* and *draw* (vv. 44, 45). The first of these three terms does not, any more than the other two, refer to the eternal decree of election; there would rather be, in that case, the perfect *has given*. Jesus speaks of a divine action exerted in the heart of the believers at the moment when they give themselves to Him. This action is opposed not to human freedom, but to a purely carnal attraction, to the gross Messianic aspirations, which had, on this very morning, drawn these crowds to Jesus (ver. 26). It is that hunger and thirst after righteousness (Matt. v. 6) which the preparatory action of the Father produces in sincere souls. Every time that Jesus sees such a soul coming to Him, He receives it as a gift of God, and His success with it is certain. I do not think that it is neces-

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  D It<sup>all</sup> Syr<sup>cur</sup> omit *εξω*.

<sup>2</sup> A B L T some Mnn. read *απο τ. ουρ.*, instead of *εκ τ. ουρ.*

<sup>3</sup>  $\aleph$  D L: *ποιησω*, instead of *ποιω*.

<sup>4</sup>  $\aleph$  C omit from *του πεμψ. με* ver. 38 to *του πεμψ. με* ver. 39.

sary to translate *ἴξει* (*shall reach*), as if it were *ἰέλσεται* (*shall come, advance towards*); for *ἦκω* signifies: "I am come and am here;" comp. viii. 42 and Apoc. iii. 3, xv. 4, where the substitution of *ἔρχεσθαι* (*to come*) for *ἦκων* would certainly weaken the thought. Jesus means to say, not only that all those whom the Father gives Him will advance towards Him, will believe, but will reach the end. It will not happen to them, as to the present hearers of Jesus, to be shipwrecked on the way. The second part of the verse is *parallel* with the first. Commonly, an *advance* on the first is found here, by making the first words: *He that cometh to me*, the resumption of the last words of the preceding clause: *shall come to me*. (See Meyer, Weiss, etc.) But two things seem to me to exclude this interpretation: 1. The substitution in this second sentence of *ἔρχεσθαι* for *ἦκων*, which would be a weakening, since the former says less than the latter; 2. The parallelism of the two present tenses (*δίδωσι*, *gives*, and *τὸν ἐρχόμενον* *him that comes*), and that of the two futures (*ἴξει*, *will reach*, and *ἐκβάλω*, *will cast out*). *He that comes to me* answers therefore to: *All that which the Father gives me*; they are the two sides, divine and human, of the inward preparation for salvation. Then: *shall come to me* answers to: *I will not cast out*; it is the accomplishment of the salvation itself in the positive and negative relation. Jesus seems to allude by this last term, *to cast out*, to the stern manner in which He had received this multitude which were so eager to come to Him, and had repelled them with a sort of harshness (vv. 26, 36). He received them thus only because He did not recognize in them gifts of the Father; for never will any heart burdened with spiritual wants and coming to Him under this divine impulse be rejected by Him. These words recall those of the Synoptics: "*Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest*" (Matt. xi. 28). The second clause has, therefore, fundamentally the same sense as the first; but it completes it, first by individualizing the *πάν*, *all*, of the first clause (*he that*), then by substituting the negative form, which excludes every exception (*I will not cast out*) to the simple affirmation (*shall come*). The certainty of this welcome full of love promised to believers is justified in ver. 38 by the complete dependence in which Jesus placed Himself with relation to the Father, when coming here on earth. Having renounced every work of His own, He can only receive whoever draws near marked with the seal of the Father. The term *καταβέβηκα*, *I am come down*, contains the affirmation of His pre-existence. On the expression "*my own will*," see at ver. 30. If Jesus had wished to accomplish here below a work *for Himself*, distinct from that of the Father, His reception or His refusals would have been determined, at least in part, by personal sympathies or repugnances, and would not have altogether coincided with the preparation due to the work of God in the souls. But, as there is nothing of this, and as He has no will except to make that of His Father at each moment His own, it follows that whoever comes to Him as one commended by the Father, is sure to be welcomed by Him; comp. the same idea of voluntary dependence in the discourse of chap. v.

Ver. 39. "Now this is the will of him who sent me,<sup>1</sup> that I should lose nothing of all that which he has given me, but that I should raise it<sup>2</sup> up at the last day."<sup>3</sup> The *δέ* is progressive: *now*. The will of the Father is not only that Jesus should receive, but also that He should *keep* those whom He gives to Him. And He has clothed Him, indeed, with the necessary powers to save His own, even to the end. He is charged of God with leading them to the glorious end of salvation and even with delivering them from death. *Ἦν, all*, nominative absolute: put afterwards in its regular case in the pronoun *αὐτοῦ*. Was Jesus thinking perchance of the bread, also a gift of God, of which no fragment should be lost (ver. 12), and in comparison with which the gift of God of which He here speaks is infinitely more precious?—The object of the verb is a *τι* understood.—The perfect *has given* transports us to a more advanced time than ver. 37 (*gives*). The gift is now *realized* by the faith of the man, on the one side, and the welcome of Jesus on the other. But the end is not yet attained by this. It is necessary first to prevent the believer from falling back into the state of sin which would destroy him again, then to free him at the last day from physical death to the end of presenting him glorious before the face of the Father. We find here again the two-fold action which Jesus described in v. 21–29: the communication of the new spiritual life and thereby the gift of the resurrection of the body, which alone exhausts the meaning of the expression: *bread of life*. *Reuss* wished to apply the term *the last day* to the time of the death of each believer. But the passage v. 29 proves that Jesus is thinking, not of a particular phase of each individual existence, but of the solemn hour when all the dead, laid *in the tombs*, shall hear His voice and shall have a bodily resurrection. *Reuss* objects that "mystical theology has nothing to do with this notion." This only proves one thing: that "the mystical theology" which *Reuss* attributes to John is very different from that of the apostle. If this notion had so little importance to the author's mind, how is it that it reappears even four times in this passage and forms, as it were, its refrain (vv. 39, 40, 44, 54)? It is beyond all dispute that the bodily resurrection is presented in this passage, as well as in the discourse of chap. v., as the necessary crowning of the spiritual work accomplished by Christ in humanity. On this point, John is in accord with the Synoptics and with Paul (1 Cor. xv.). *Beugel* observes on these last words: *Hic finis est ultra quem periculum nullum*. On the inadmissibility of grace, see on x. 28–30. In closing this first part of the conversation, Jesus again insists on the human condition of faith which must correspond with His own work, for it was this which was wanting to His interlocutors.

Ver. 40. "For<sup>4</sup> this is the will of my Father;<sup>5</sup> that whosoever beholds the Son

A B D L T 10 Mnn. Italic Syr. omit *πατρος* (of the Father).

<sup>2</sup> The MSS. are divided between *αυτο* (Σ A B C etc.) and *αυτον* (E G H etc.).

<sup>3</sup> 12 Mjj. (B C etc.) reject *εἰ*.

<sup>4</sup> The MSS. are divided between *γαρ*, for,

(Σ A B C D K L U Π 30 Mnn. It. Syr. Cop.) and *δε* which is read by T. R. with the 8 other Mjj.

<sup>5</sup> T. R. with 10 Mjj. (A E etc.): *του πεμφαντος με* (of him who sent me): Σ B C D etc. *του πατρος μου* (of my Father); M Δ: *του πεμφαντος με πατρος* (of the Father who sent me).

and believes on him has eternal life, and I<sup>1</sup> will raise him up at the last day.”<sup>2</sup> This verse reproduces, either by confirming it (*for*, according to the Alexandrian authorities and the ancient versions), or by completing it (*now*, according to the Byzantine authorities), the thought of ver. 39. The principal difference is that in ver. 40 Jesus sets forth by the side of the gift which the Father makes in the person of the Son, the subjective act of the man who beholds and believes. In this expression is the decisive point. The two present participles, θεωρῶν καὶ πιστεύων, *who beholds and believes*, indicate the rapid succession of the two acts: “He who gives himself up to the contemplation and in whom it is immediately changed into faith.” This is the intentional antithesis of ver. 36: “*You have seen me, and you do not believe.*” The commission which the Father has given to Jesus is not to save all men indiscriminately. His work is to offer Himself to the sight of all, and, where the sight becomes contemplation and contemplation becomes faith, there to save. The Alexandrian reading: *of my Father*, is more in harmony with the term *Son*. On the other hand, the received reading: *of him that sent me*, accords better with the words: *he that beholds*: “He has sent me that I might offer myself for contemplation.” The term θεωρεῖν, *to behold*, indicates a more reflective act than the simple ὁρᾶν, *to see*, of ver. 36. He only *beholds* who has been sufficiently struck by the mere sight to pause before the object with emotion. Jesus substitutes here the masculine πᾶς for the neuter πᾶν (ver. 39), of which He had made use, because faith is an individual act. The history of Jesus’ ministry in the Synoptics is the commentary on this verse. Is it not by this sign, faith, that He recognizes those whom He can receive and save? Luke v. 20: “*Seeing their faith, he said, Man, thy sins are forgiven thee.*” He does not Himself know either the individuals or the number of persons of whom the whole gift (τὸ πᾶν) which the Father bestows upon Him will be composed; God, in sending Him, has given to Him only this watchword: *Whosoever believeth*. The two ἀναστήσω, in vv. 39, 40, may be made subjunctive aorists depending on ἵνα: “and that I may raise it up.” It is certainly so, in my view, with that of ver. 39; but perhaps we must detach that of ver. 40 from the preceding and see in it a future indicative. “And this done, I charge myself with raising him at the last day, without any possibility that anything should be able to prevent the accomplishment of this last work.” The pronoun *me*, especially placed as it is, seems to me to be better explained in this way.

In the presence of Jewish unbelief, Jesus has strengthened Himself anew by the assurance of the success of His work. He has explained the severity of His conduct towards the Jews: God has said: “He who sees and believes; and as for them, they have seen and have not believed.” There was here a serious charge against his hearers. Far from accepting it, they endeavor to throw it back upon Him.

<sup>1</sup> A D some Mss. omit ἐγώ.

<sup>2</sup> N A D K L S U II read *ev* which T R omits with 11 Mj.

## 2. Vv. 41-51.

A murmur which rises in the assembly (vv. 41, 42) forces Jesus to declare to the Jews distinctly their incompetency in this matter (vv. 43-46); after which, with an increasing solemnity, He again affirms Himself to be the bread of life (vv. 47-51); and this while adding in the last words (ver. 51 b) a striking, defining phrase, which becomes the occasion of a new phase of the conversation.

Vv. 41, 42. "The Jews therefore murmured concerning him, because he said: I am the bread which came down from heaven. 42. And they said: Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother<sup>1</sup> we ourselves know? How then<sup>2</sup> does he say:<sup>3</sup> I came down from heaven?" The term: *murmured*, must denote an unfavorable whispering which made itself heard in the circle of hearers. The objective words *περὶ αὐτοῦ, concerning Him*, are explained by the following words: The term *Ἰουδαῖοι, the Jews*, might refer to the emissaries of the Sanhedrim, who, according to the Synoptics, had come from Judea to watch the words and actions of Jesus in Galilee. But the following words: *we know*, are more easily explained in the mouths of the Galileans themselves. John applies to them here this title, which is customary in his Gospel (Intro., vol. I., p. 128), because of the community in unbelief which, from this time, unites them with the mass of the Jewish nation which persists in remaining Jewish and refuses to become believing. It is impossible for them to recognize a heavenly being, who has become incarnate, in Him with whose human filiation they are perfectly acquainted. The pronoun *ἡμεῖς, we*, does not necessarily indicate a personal acquaintance, from which it might be inferred that Joseph was still living. This expression may signify: "We know *the name* of his parents." *Nūn, now*, may be read with some Alexandrian documents, instead of *οὖν, therefore*: it means: *in this state of things*. Criticism has asked how the people could be ignorant of the miraculous birth of Jesus, if this were a real fact, and why Jesus did not notice this point in His reply. But Jesus' birth had taken place in Judea; thirty years separated it from the period in which we now find ourselves. During the long obscurity which had enveloped the childhood and youth of Jesus, all had passed into oblivion, and that, probably, even in the places where the facts had occurred; how much more in Galilee, where the mass of the people had always been ignorant of them. Assuredly, neither the parents of Jesus, nor Jesus Himself could make allusion to them in public; this would have been to expose the most sacred mystery of family history to a profane, and, in addition to this, useless discussion. For the miraculous origin of Jesus is not a means of producing faith; it can be accepted only by the heart already believing. As *Weiss* says: "It is not really these scruples which are the cause of their unbelief. And this is the reason why Jesus does not stop to refute them." Instead, therefore, of descending

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  adds *καὶ* before *τον πατέρα* and with *b* Syrc<sup>ms</sup> omits *καὶ τὴν μητέρα*.

<sup>2</sup> B C T Cop. read *νῦν* instead of *οὖν*.

<sup>3</sup> B C D L T  $\alpha$  Cop. omit *οὗτος*.

to this ground, Jesus remains in the moral sphere, and discovers to the Galileans, as He had done to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, chap. v., the true cause of their unbelief.

Vv. 43, 44. "*Jesus therefore*<sup>1</sup> *answered and said to them: Murnur not among yourselves: 44. No one can come to me except the Father who sent me draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day.*"<sup>2</sup> In other words: "A truce to these murmurs; it is not my word that is absurd; it is you who are incapable of comprehending it, and all your "*hows*" will serve no purpose, so long as you remain in this moral condition." Jesus goes back again to the source of their discontent; the spiritual drawing which results from the inward teaching of God is wanting to them. This is what vv. 37-40 already made known to us. The word *οὐδεὶς*, *no one*, is the antithesis of *πᾶν*, *all*, ver. 37. There, Jesus said: all that which is given shall certainly come: here, nothing which is not drawn shall succeed in understanding and believing. This second declaration has a direct application to the hearers. The *drawing* of the Father designates the same fact as the *gift* (ver. 37), but this term serves to explain the mode of it; the gift is effected by means of an inward drawing which makes itself felt in the soul. We shall see at ver. 45 that this drawing is not a blind instinct, like the natural inclinations, but that it is luminous in its nature, like God Himself from whom it proceeds; it is a *teaching*. This teaching should have been accomplished by means of the *writings of Moses* taken seriously (v. 46, 47), by the *Word of God* inwardly received (v. 38). The law by making the Jew feel the insufficiency of his obedience and the opposition between his feelings and the Divine will, and prophecy, by exciting the expectation of Him who should remedy the evil, make Jesus a being known and desired, towards whom a profound attraction cannot fail to make itself felt as soon as He appears. *Weiss* sees in the drawing and teaching of the Father the divine testimony by means of miracles, v. 36, rendered efficacious in the heart by the Holy Spirit. This seems to me too external; and why then exclude the principal divine witness, that of the Word mentioned also in chap. v.? We must observe the correlation between the subject *he that sent me* and the verb *draw*; the God who sends Jesus for souls, on the other hand, draws souls to Jesus. The two divine works, external and internal, answer to and complete each other. The happy moment in which they meet in the heart, and in which the will is thus gained, is that of the *gift* on God's part, of *faith* on man's part. Jesus adds that, as the initiative in salvation belongs to the Father, the *completion* of it is the task of the Son. The Father draws and gives; the Son receives and keeps, and this even to the glorious crowning of the work, the final resurrection. Between these two extremes is included the entire development of salvation. The sense of the last words is: And I will bring the whole to its end.

Vv. 45, 46. "*It is written in the prophets: And they shall be all taught of*

<sup>1</sup> *Οὐδ* is omitted in B C K L T II 10 Mnn.  
Itallq Syr. Cop.

<sup>2</sup> T.R. omits *ev* with  $\aleph$   $\Delta$  several Mpn.

God. Every one,<sup>1</sup> who has heard<sup>2</sup> the Father, and has learned from Him, comes to me: 46 not that any one has seen the Father, except he who is from God,<sup>3</sup> he has seen the Father.”<sup>4</sup> This passage presents a remarkable example of the manner in which Jesus cites the Old Testament. It is not from this book that He derived the thought which He here develops; it arose in Him spontaneously, as is shown by the perfectly original form in which it has been previously expressed: the *gift*, the *drawing* of the Father. But, afterwards, He thinks fit to cite the Old Testament as the authority recognized by the people. If He was already in the synagogue (ver. 59), He might have in His hands the roll which contained the prophecies of Isaiah, and, as He said these words: “*It is written*,” He might read this very passage. Comp. Luke iv. 17 ff. This would explain the retaining of the copula, *and*, at the beginning of the quotation. These words are found in Is. liv. 13. Isaiah here declares that the whole Messianic community will be composed of persons *taught of God*, whence it follows that it is only men who are in the inward school of God who can truly give themselves to the Messiah. According to Meyer, the general expression, *in the prophets*, signifies: in the sacred volume containing the prophets. This meaning follows, indeed, from the terms *in* and *is written*. It is nevertheless true that Jesus is not thinking only of the passage of Isaiah, which He quotes textually, but that He sees all the prophets rising in chorus to testify to this same truth; otherwise, why not name Isaiah, as is done elsewhere? Comp. Jer. xxxi. 33, 34; Joel ii. 28 ff. The second part of the 45th verse is commonly understood in this sense: “Every man who, *after having heard* the teaching (*ἀκούσας*), consents to *receive* it internally (*καὶ καθόν*), comes to me.” With this sense, the teaching would be given to all men, as objects of the pre-eminent grace of God, but it would be expressly distinguished from the free acceptance of this teaching, which is true of only a certain number of them. The *πᾶς*, *whoever*, would have, therefore, a much more restricted sense than the *πάντες*, *all*, of the first clause. But, convenient as this explanation would be to dispose of the doctrine of predestination, we believe that it is contrary to the true sense of the word *all* in the passage of Isaiah and in the mouth of Jesus. This word in the former designates only the members of the *Messianic* community, altogether like the word *πᾶς* in the mouth of the latter. The meaning is rather this: As Isaiah has declared, all my believers must be *taught* of the Father; but of these not one shall fail. The *whoever* merely individualizes the idea of *all*. Jesus does not place in opposition here the teaching given and the teaching received; for the question is of an inward teaching, working from the first in the heart. Hence it follows that if the Jews do not believe, it is because this divine teaching has not been effected in them. Hence their *inability* to believe (ver. 44); but this inability is

<sup>1</sup> *Ouv* (therefore) of the T. R., with 11 Mjj. Syr. etc., is omitted by  $\aleph$  B C D L S T, some Mnn. It<sup>pl</sup>erique Vulg. Cop.

<sup>2</sup> T. R. reads *ἀκουσας* with  $\aleph$  A B C K L T II the larger part of the Mnn. It<sup>pl</sup> Vulg. Syr.

Orig. *ἀκουων* is read in 11 Mjj. 90 Mnn. It<sup>pl</sup>erique.

<sup>3</sup>  $\aleph$ : *του πατρος* (of the Father), instead of *του θεου*.

<sup>4</sup>  $\aleph$  D It<sup>pl</sup>: *τον θεου* (God), instead of *τον πατερα*.

wholly chargeable to them. Perhaps *Weiss* is right in insisting on the rejection of the word *οὖν*, therefore, which connects the two clauses of this verse. The second may be regarded as a reaffirmation of, as well as a conclusion from the first. We may hesitate between the readings *ἀκούσας* and *ἀκούων*, who has heard or who hears. On the one hand, the aorist may have been substituted for the present, because it was supposed that the first participle must be accommodated to the second. But, on the other hand, the present, which expresses the continuance of the hearing, is less suitable than the past, which indicates an act accomplished for the future at the moment when faith is produced. It is therefore through their previous want of docility with regard to the means prepared by God, that these hearers have brought themselves into an incapacity for believing. This saying implies in Jesus the infinitely exalted feeling of what His person and His work are. In order to come to Him, there is need of nothing less than a drawing of a divine order. "He feels Himself above everything which the natural man can love and understand" (*Gess*). The true sense of this passage does not imply the notion of predestination (in so far as it is exclusive of liberty), but, on the contrary, sets it aside. The inability of the Jews to believe arises from the fact that they come to Him, not as persons taught of God, but as slaves of the flesh. They possessed the means of doing better; hence their culpability.

Ver. 46. The phrase *οὐχ ὅτι*, not that, marks a restriction. This restriction can only refer to the term *teaching* (ver. 45). The notion of teaching seems to imply a direct contact between the disciple and the Master. Now no other but Jesus has possessed and possesses the privilege of immediate contact with God through sight. All can certainly *hear*, it is true, but He alone *has seen*. And this is the reason why the divine teaching of which He has just spoken is only preparatory; it is designed not to take the place of His own, but to lead to Him, the only one who has seen and consequently can reveal God perfectly, xvii. 3; comp. Matt. xi. 27. This saying is, certainly, one of those from which John has drawn the fundamental ideas of his Prologue (comp. i. 1, 14, 18). If the preposition *παρά*, from, were not connected with the words *ὁ ὢν*, who is, it might be applied solely to the mission of Jesus. But that participle obliges us to think of origin and essence; comp. vii. 29. This *παρά* is the counterpart of the *πρός* of i. 1; united, they sum up the entire relation of the Son to the Father. Everything in the Son is from (*παρά*) the Father and tends to (*πρός*) the Father.

Does the sight of the Father here ascribed to Jesus proceed from His divine state before the incarnation, as most interpreters and even *Weiss* think? This does not seem to me possible. It is the contents of the human consciousness which He has of God, which He sets forth to His brethren in human words. Comp. iii. 34, 35, where His knowledge of God is inferred from the communication of the Spirit without measure, which has been made to Him as man; the same in xiv. 10, where it is explained by the communion in which He lives here on earth with the Father. The perfect *ἑώρακε*, has seen, proves absolutely nothing for the

contrary view; comp. viii. 38, and the analogous expressions, v. 19, 20, which evidently refer to His earthly existence. Only it must not be forgotten that the unique intimacy of this paternal and filial relation rests on the eternal relation of Jesus to the Father; comp. xvii. 24: "Thou didst love me before the foundation of the world." It is *because* this son of man is the eternal well-beloved of the Father, that God completely communicates Himself to Him. The readings of  $\aleph$ : "who comes *from the Father*," instead of "*from God*," and of  $\aleph$  D: "has seen *God*," instead of "*the Father*," arose undoubtedly from the desire to make our text more literally conformed to the parallel expressions of the Prologue; comp. for the first i. 14: *παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς*, and for the second i. 18: *θεὸν ἑώρακε*. By this saying Jesus gives it to be understood that after the divine teaching has led to the Son, it is He, the Son, who, in His turn, leads to the Father: "*I am the way, the truth and the life; no one comes to the Father but by me*" (xiv. 6). Through this idea Jesus comes back to the principal idea which had excited the murmuring of the Jews and He reaffirms it with still more of solemnity than before, in the words of vv. 47-51:

Vv. 47-51. "*Verily, verily, I say unto you: He who believes on me<sup>1</sup> has eternal life. 48. I am the bread of life. 49. Your fathers did eat the manna in the wilderness, and they are dead. 50. This is the bread that comes down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die. 51. I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread,<sup>2</sup> he shall live<sup>3</sup> forever; and<sup>4</sup> this bread which I will give is my flesh which I will give for the life of the world.*"<sup>5</sup> The words *verily, verily*, are uttered with the sense of authority which Jesus derives from the unique position which He holds according to ver. 46, and in opposition to the objections of the Jews (vv. 41, 42). "It is thus, whatever you may say of it." Jesus' tone becomes gradually more elevated, and assumes more of energy and solemnity. The words *εἰς ἐμέ, on me*, omitted by four Alexandrian documents, are perfectly suited to the context, in which the principal idea is the person of Jesus.

Ver. 48. The affirmations follow each other in the way of *asyndeton*, like oracles. That of ver. 48 justifies that of ver. 47. By that of ver. 49 He gives back to His hearers their own word of ver. 31. The manna which their fathers ate was so far from the bread of life that it did not prevent them from dying. This word undoubtedly denotes physical death; but as being the effect of a divine condemnation.

Ver. 50. "Here is the bread which will truly accomplish the result that you desire." The *ἵνα, in order that*, might depend on *ὁ καταβαλῶν, which comes down*, but it is better to make it depend on the principal idea: "It is here . . . *in order that* one may eat of it and not die," for: "in order that if one . . . he may not die." It is still the Hebrew paratactic con-

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  B L T omit *εἰς ἐμέ (on me)* in opposition to all the other Mss. Vss. and Fathers.

<sup>2</sup>  $\aleph$  Italic read *ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ ἄρτου (of my bread)*, instead of *ἐκ τούτου τοῦ ἄρτου*.

<sup>3</sup>  $\aleph$  D L: *ζῆσει*, instead of *ζήσεται*.

<sup>4</sup>  $\aleph$  omits *καὶ (and)* and also, with D F, *δε*.

<sup>5</sup> The words *ἢν ἐγὼ δώσω* are omitted by B

C D L T some Mss. Italic Vulg. Syriac Orig. (twice) Tisch. ed. 1849. The T. R. is supported by 11 Mss. the greater part of the Mss. Italic Cop. Syriac Orig. (twice).  $\aleph$  reads *ὁ ἄρτος ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω ὑπὲρ τῆς του κόσμου ζωῆς ἢ σὰρξ μου ἐστίν (the bread which I will give for the life of the world, is my flesh)*.

struction. To perform the first of these acts is *ipso facto* to realize the second. Several commentators take the word *die*, in ver. 50, in the moral sense of *perdition*. But the preceding antithesis, the death of the Jews in the wilderness, does not allow this explanation. Jesus here and elsewhere, denies even physical death for the believer (comp. viii. 51); which He of course does not mean in the absolute sense in which it would become an absurdity (see *Keil* who makes the idea of the resurrection, ver. 40, an objection against me), but in the sense that what properly constitutes death in what we call by that name—the total failing of the physical and moral being, does not take place at the time when his brethren see him die. Morally and physically, Jesus remains his life, even at that moment, and, by His personal communion with him, takes away the death of death.

The affirmation of ver. 51a is the summing up of all that precedes, with the design of passing to a new idea (51b). The epithet ὁ ζῶν, *the living bread*, declares even more clearly than the expression *bread of life* (ver. 48), that Jesus is not only the bread which gives life, but that He is Himself the divine life realized in a human person; and it is for this end that He gives life to him who receives it within himself.

Ver. 51b. The second part of the verse is connected with the first by the two particles *καί* and *δέ*, which indicate an idea at once co-ordinated (*καί, and*) and progressive (*δέ, now*) with reference to all that precedes: “*And moreover;*” or: “*And, finally, to tell you all.*” Jesus is now resolved to make them hear the paradox even to the end; for it is here indeed that, as *Weiss* says, the *hard saying* begins (ver. 60). At first Jesus had spoken in general of a higher food of which the miraculous bread of the day before was the image and pledge. Then He had declared that this bread was Himself, His entire person. And now He gives them to understand that He will be able to become the bread of life for the world only on condition of dying, of giving Himself to it as sacrificed. This is the reason why, instead of saying *me*, He from this time onward uses the expression, *my flesh*. How can His flesh be given as food to the world? Jesus explains this by this new determining phrase: ἦν ἐγὼ δώσω, “(my flesh) *which I will give.*” These words are rejected, it is true, by the Alexandrian authorities, but no doubt because of the apparent tautology which they present with the words which precede: ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω, “(the bread) *which I will give.*” They should be retained in the text, as *Meyer* has acknowledged, notwithstanding his ordinary prepossession in favor of the Alexandrian readings, and whatever *Weiss*, *Keil*, *Westcott*, etc., may say. The limiting words *for the life of the world* cannot be directly connected with the words *my flesh*; what would the expression: “my flesh for the life of the world” mean? A participle like *given* or *broken* would be necessary. 1 Cor. xi. 24 is cited: “This is my body [broken] for you.” But there, there is at least the article τὸ which serves as a basis for the limiting word. *Weiss* so clearly perceives the difference that he proposes to make the limiting phrase: *for the life of the world*, depend, not on the words *my flesh*, but on the verb *εἶπεν*, *is*, and to make *my flesh* an appositional phrase to *the bread*: “The bread which I will give, that is to say, my flesh, is for the life of the world.” But

even if it were possible to allow such an apposition and so harsh a use of the verb *ἔστιν* (the passage xi. 4 is too different to prove anything), would not the future *δώσω*, *I will give*, require that the verb *to be* should also be placed in the future: "The bread which I will give, my flesh, *shall be* for the life of the world?" His flesh will not be able to serve for the life of the world except after it shall have been given. The reading of the *Sinaitic MS.* is an unhappy attempt to restore the text after the omission of the words *ἢν ἐγὼ δώσω* had made it intolerable. The first *which I will give*, applied to the bread, is to be paraphrased thus: "which I will give *to be eaten*;" it sums up the preceding conversation. The second, applied to my flesh, signifies: "which I will give *to be sacrificed*;" it forms the transition to the following passage (*my flesh and my blood*). It is in view of this double relation and this double sense that the words: *which I will give*, had to be repeated. In fact, the flesh of Jesus cannot be eaten as *food* by each believer, until after it shall have been offered for the world as a *victim*. This expression: *my flesh*, especially in connection, as it is here, with the future *I will give*, which points to a fact yet to occur, can only refer to the sacrifice of the cross. The interpreters who, like *Clement and Origen, de Wette, Reuss, Keil*, etc., apply the term *give* to the voluntary consecration which Jesus makes of His person during His earthly life, take no account of the *καὶ δέ, and moreover*, which indicates a different idea from that which precedes, and of the future *I will give*, which permits us to think only of a gift yet to come. In this verse is betrayed more and more distinctly the pre-occupation with the Paschal feast which filled the soul of Jesus from the beginning of this scene, which was one of the grandest in His life. The expression: "the life of the world" shows that the new Passover, of which Jesus is thinking, will have an altogether different extent from the old one: it is the entire human race which will be invited to it as soon as the victim shall have been offered and the feast of sacrifice can be celebrated.

## 3. Vv. 52-59.

Ver. 52. "*The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying: How can he give us his flesh<sup>1</sup> to eat?*" The term *ἐμάχοντο*, *strove*, goes beyond the *ἐγόγγυζον*, *murmured*, of ver. 41; it is now a violent debate following after a whispered murmuring. The words *among themselves* seem to contradict the appositional word *saying*, which apparently indicates that the saying was unanimous. But the same question might really be found on all lips, while yet there was no agreement among those who presented it. Some arrived at the conclusion: It is absurd. Others, under the impression of the miracle of the day before and of the sacred and mysterious character of Jesus' words, maintained, in spite of everything, that He was, indeed, the Messiah. At the sight of this altercation, Jesus not only persists in His affirmation, but strengthens it by using expressions which were more and more concrete. Not only does He speak of *eating His flesh* and *drinking His blood*, but He also makes of this mysterious act the

<sup>1</sup> B T Itplerique add *αυτου* after *την σαρκα*.

condition of life (vv. 53-56); He speaks of eating *Himself* (ver. 57); and finally, sums up the whole conversation in the final declaration of ver. 58. The evangelist closes by indicating the place of the scene (ver. 59). The true text says: "*the flesh*," not: *His* flesh, although it is indeed the flesh of Jesus that is in question. That which is revolting to them is, that this is the flesh which must nourish them in eternal life.

Vv. 53-55. "*Jesus therefore said to them: Verily, verily, I say to you, that unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you will not have life in yourselves.* 54. *He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.*<sup>1</sup> 55. *For my flesh is truly food<sup>2</sup> and my blood is truly<sup>2</sup> drink.*"<sup>3</sup>—*Verily*: "It is so, whatever you may think of it!" The Lord attests this first in the negative form (ver. 53), then positively (ver. 54). The term *Son of man*, recalls the notion of the incarnation, by means of which the eternal life, realized in Him in a human life, is placed within reach of the faith of man. *Reuss* and *Keil* think that the terms *flesh* and *blood* may be understood here as in the passages where the expression *flesh and blood* denotes a living human person, for example, Gal. i. 16. But in these cases the blood is regarded as contained in the flesh which lives by means of it, while in our passage the two elements are considered as separated. The blood is shed since it is drunk; and the flesh is broken since the blood is shed. These expressions imply that Jesus has present to His thought the type of the Paschal lamb. It was the blood of this victim which, sprinkled on the lintels of the doors, had in Egypt secured the people from the stroke of the angel of death and which, in the ceremony of the sacrifice of the lamb in the temple, was poured out on the horns of the altar, taking the place in this case of the doors of the Israelite houses; its flesh it was which formed the principal food of the Paschal supper. The shed blood represents expiation; and *to drink* this blood is to appropriate to oneself by faith the expiation and find in it reconciliation with God, the basis of salvation. The flesh broken represents the holy life of Christ; and *to eat* it, is to appropriate to oneself that life of obedience and love; it is to receive it through the action of the Spirit who makes it our life. In these two inward facts salvation is summed up. If, then Jesus does not directly answer the *How?* of the Jews, He nevertheless does give indirectly, as He had done with Nicodemus, the desired explanation. As in chap. iii. He had substituted for the expression "*born anew*" the more explicit words "*born of water and Spirit*," so He here completes the expression "*to eat His flesh*" by the expression "*to drink His blood*," which was suited to recall the type of the lamb and to give these Jews, who celebrated the Paschal feast every year, a glimpse of the truth declared in this paradoxical form. The *ἐν αὐτοῖς*, *in yourselves*, recalls the word addressed to the Samaritan woman iv. 14. Here again is the idea of the possession in Christ of a fountain of life springing up continually within the believer.

<sup>1</sup> The MSS. are divided between *τη* and *εν τη*.

<sup>2</sup> Ⲛ DEHM SUV ΓΔ Δ Mnn. Itierlique Vulg. Syr. Orig. (3 times): *αληθως* (*truly*); B C F\* K L T II 30 Mnn. Cop. Orig. (5 times);

*αληθης* (*a true*).

<sup>3</sup> Ⲛ omits the words *βρωσις . . . εστι* (confusion of the two *εστι*) and reads *ποτον* instead of *ποσις*.—D omits the words *και . . . ποσις*.

Ver. 54. After having given this explanation in a negative form (without this eating and this drinking, impossibility of living), Jesus completes the expression of His thought by adding: By this eating and this drinking, assured possession of life. Then He raises the eye of the believer even to the glorious limit of this impartation of life—the resurrection of the body. The relation between these last words: “*And I will raise him up . . .*,” and the preceding ones is so close that it is difficult to avoid seeing an organic connection between the possession of the spiritual life and the final resurrection; comp. Rom. viii. 10, 11. However this may be, the bodily resurrection is by no means a useless superfetation relatively to the spiritual life, according to the thought which *Reuss* ascribes to John. Here is the fourth time that Jesus promises it in this discourse as the consummation of the salvation which He brings to mankind; comp. vv. 39, 40, 44. *Nature* restored and glorified is the end of the victory gained by the divine grace over sin.

The 55th verse justifies the preceding negation and affirmation. If to eat this flesh and to drink this blood are the condition of life, it is because this flesh and this blood are, *in all reality*, food and drink. A part of the critical authorities present the reading ἀληθῶς, “is truly;” the rest read ἀληθής: is true food . . . true drink. The former reading is more in conformity with the style of John. As *Lücke* observes, John ordinarily makes ἀληθής refer to moral veracity, in contrast to ψεῦδος (falsehood), but he also connects the adverb ἀληθῶς with a substantive (i. 48: ἀληθῶς Ἰοραηλίτης; perhaps viii. 31: ἀληθῶς μαθηταί). Moreover, the sense of the two readings is not sensibly different. The adverb or the adjective expresses the full reality of the vital communication effected by these elements, which are truly for the soul what food is for the body. Vv. 56, 57 explain how this communication of life is effected. By this food of the soul Christ dwells in us and we in Him (ver. 56), and this is to live (ver. 57).

Vv. 56, 57. “*He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me, and I in him. 57. As the living Father sent me, and I live by the Father, so he who eats me, he also shall live<sup>1</sup> by me.*” By drinking through faith at the fountain of the expiation obtained by the blood of Christ and by nourishing oneself through the Spirit on the life realized in His flesh, we contract a union with Him through which His person dwells in us and we in it. This *dwelling* of the believer in Jesus is for his moral being, as it were, a transplanting from the soil of his own life into the new soil which the perfect righteousness and the holy strength of Christ offer him: renunciation of all merit, all force, all wisdom derived from what belongs to himself, and absolute confidence in Christ, as in Him who possesses all that is needed in order to fill the void. The *abiding* of Christ, which corresponds to this abiding of the believer in Him, expresses the real effective communication which Christ makes of His own personality (“he who eats *me*” ver. 57). This mutual relation being formed, the believer *lives*: why? This is what ver. 57 explains.

<sup>1</sup> The MSS. vary between ζήσεται (ΓΔ etc.), ζήσει (Σ B etc.), and ζή (CD).

Ver. 57. To be in communion with Jesus is to live, because Jesus has access Himself to the highest source of life, namely, God. "Life passes from the Son to the believer, as it passes from the Father to the Son," (*Weiss*). This second transmission is at once the model (*καθώς, as*) and the principle (*καί, also*) of the first. The principal clause does not begin, as Chrysostom thought, with the words *καὶ ὡς ζῶ, I also live*, but with *καὶ ὁ τρώγων, also he who eats me*. There are two parallel declarations: the first, bearing on the relation between God and Jesus, the second, on the relation between Jesus and the believer; each one containing two clauses: the one relating to Him who gives; the other to him who receives. Jesus is a messenger of God, fulfilling a mission here on earth; He who has given it to Him is the living Father, ὁ ζῶν πατήρ, the author, the primordial and absolute source of life; it is in communion with this Father that Jesus, His Son and messenger, derives unceasingly, during His earthly existence, the life, light and strength which are necessary to fulfill His mission. "I live by the Father." The word ζῶ, *I live*, does not indicate merely the fact of existence; it is at once the physical and moral life, with all their different manifestations. Every time that He acts or speaks, Jesus seeks in God what is necessary for Him for this end and receives it. It is not exact to render *διὰ* (with the accusative) as we have been obliged to do, by the preposition *by* (*per patrem*). Jesus did not express Himself in this way (*διὰ* with the genitive) because He did not wish to say merely that God was the force *by means* of which He worked. But, on the other hand, it would be still more inexact to translate: *because of the Father* (*propter patrem; Lange, Westcott*), in the sense of: with a view to the service or the glory of the Father. For the preposition *διὰ* with the accusative signifies, not *with a view to* (the purpose), but *because of* (the cause). Jesus means to say that, as sent by the Father, He unceasingly has from God the moral cause of His activity. It is in the Father that He finds the source and norm of each one of His movements, from Him that He gets the vital principle of His being. The Father, in sending the Son, has secured to Him this unique relation, and the Son continues sedulously faithful to it (v. 17). Thus it happens that the life of the Father is perfectly reproduced on earth: Jesus is God lived in a human life. From this results the fact described in the second part of the verse. Grammatically speaking, this second part forms but one proposition. But, logically, the first member indicating the subject; "*He who eats me*," corresponds with the first proposition of the preceding declaration: "*As the Father sent me*;" and in the same way the predicate: "*He also shall live by me*," corresponds with the second member of the first proposition: "*And as I live by the Father*." The relation which Jesus sustains to the Father has its reflection, as it were, in that which the believer sustains to Jesus, and is for the believer the secret of life. The first *καί, also*, corresponds with the *καθώς, as*, of the beginning of the verse: it is the sign of the principal proposition. It takes the place of a *ὁπώρας, so*, which was avoided because the analogy between the two relations was still not complete. For the first relation is more than the model: it is the principle, the moral reason

of the second. The latter, while being analogous to the first, exists only in virtue of the other. The second *καί* before the pronoun makes the subject prominent: *ἐκεῖνος, he also*. The believer, by feeding on Jesus, finds in Him the same source and guaranty of life as that which Jesus Himself finds in His relation to the Father. *Δὲ ἐμὲ*, not strictly *by me* or *for me*, but *because of me*, the norm and source of his life. In each act which he performs, the believer seeks in Christ his model and his strength, as Christ does with relation to the Father; and it is thus that the life of Christ and consequently that of the Father Himself become his. A thought of unfathomable depth is contained in this saying: Jesus only has direct access to the Father, the supreme source. The life which He derives from Him, humanly elaborated and reproduced in His person, becomes thus accessible to men. As the infinite life of nature becomes capable of appropriation by man only so far as it is concentrated in a fruit or a piece of bread, so the divine life is only brought within our reach so far as it is incarnated in the Son of man. It is thus that He is for us *the bread of life*. Only, as we must take the piece of bread and assimilate it to ourselves in order to obtain physical life by its means, we must, also, in order to have the higher life, incorporate into ourselves the person of the Son of man by the inward act of faith, which is the mode of spiritual manducation. By eating Him, who lives by God, we possess the life of God. The living Father lives in One, but in this One He gives Himself to all. This is not metaphysics; it is the most practical morals, as every believer well knows. Jesus therefore reveals here at once the secret of His own life and of that of His followers. Here is the mystery of salvation, which St. Paul describes as "*the summing up of all things in one*" (Eph. i. 10). The Lord sought thus to make clear to the Jews what appeared to them incredible: that one man could be for all others the source of life. The formula here given by Christ is of course that of His earthly life; that of His divine life was given in ver. 26. It follows from these words that no other even miraculous food can give life.

Ver. 58. "*This is the bread which came down<sup>1</sup> from heaven: not as your fathers<sup>2</sup> did eat the manna<sup>3</sup> and are dead; he who eats this bread shall live<sup>4</sup> forever.*" The pronoun *αὐτος* does not mean: "*Such is the bread*" (*Reuss, Keil*); but "*This bread* (ver. 57) is that which came down,"—that which the manna was not in reality; hence the two opposite consequences pointed out in what follows. Here is the final appeal: to reject it, will be to die; to accept it, will be to live.

#### Appendix on vv. 51b–58.

What does Jesus mean by the expressions: *to eat His flesh, to drink His blood*?

1. Many interpreters see here only a *metaphor*, designating the act by which faith morally unites itself with its object. According to some (*de Wette, Reuss*),

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  omits *αὐτος* and reads *καταβαινων* instead of *καταβας*.

<sup>2</sup>  $\aleph$  B C L T Cop. Orig. omit *υμων* after *πατερες*

<sup>3</sup> The same, together with D, omit *το μαννα* (after *υμων*).

<sup>4</sup> Variants *ζησει* and *ζησεται* (ver. 57).

this object is the *historical person* of Jesus Christ as it appeared before the eyes of His hearers. The expression *My flesh* and *My blood* is to be taken in the same sense as *flesh and blood*, that is, "the human person." According to others, the object of faith is not only the living Christ (*the flesh*), but also the sacrificed Christ (*the blood*); and Jesus describes here at once the appropriation of His holy life and faith in His expiatory death. This interpretation, in one or the other of the two forms which we have just indicated, is easily connected with the beginning of the discourse; for spiritual assimilation by means of faith is certainly the idea from which the Lord starts: "*I am the bread of life, he that cometh to Me shall not hunger, and he that believeth on Me shall never thirst*" (ver. 35). Only we cannot understand, from this point of view, with what aim Jesus gives to this altogether spiritual conception an expression which is more and more paradoxical, material, and, consequently, unintelligible to His interlocutors. If this is all that He means to say, even in the last words of the interview, does He not seem to be playing with words and to lay Himself out needlessly to cause offense to the Jews?

2. This very real difficulty has impelled many commentators to apply these expressions to the scene of the Holy Supper, which Jesus had already had in mind at this time, and which was later to solve for His disciples the mystery of His words. But this explanation gives rise to a still greater difficulty than the preceding one. To what purpose this incomprehensible allusion to an institution which no one could foresee? Then, Jesus cannot have made the possession of eternal life depend on the accomplishment of an external act, like that of the Lord's Supper? In all His teaching, the sole condition of salvation is faith. The Tübingen School, which has attached itself to this interpretation, has derived from it an argument against the authenticity of the Gospel; and not without reason, if the explanation were well founded. But the pseudo-John, who should have wished, in the second century, to put an allusion to the Lord's Supper into the mouth of Jesus, would not have failed to employ the word *σῶμα*, *body*, used in the text of the institution of the Supper and in the Liturgical formulas, rather than *σὰρξ*, *flesh*. A proof of this is found in the unauthentic addition which we read in the *Cambridge MS. the Amiatinus*, etc., at the end of ver. 56: "If a man receives *the body* of the Son of man as the bread of life, he will have life in Him." On the passages from *Justin* (Apol. I., 66) and *Ignatius* (*ad Smyrn.*, 7), see *Weiss*. These Fathers may have founded their expression on our passage itself.

To discern the true thought of our Lord, we must, as it appears to me, distinguish carefully, in the mysterious eating and drinking here described, the act of man and the divine gift, as Jesus does Himself in ver. 27. The human act is faith, faith alone; and inasmuch as the eating and drinking designate the believer's part in his union with Jesus Christ, these terms do not go beyond the meaning which the exclusively spiritual interpretation gives to them. To eat the flesh, is to contemplate with faith the Lord's holy life and to receive that life into oneself through the Holy Spirit to the end of reproducing it in one's own life; to drink the blood, is to contemplate with faith His violent death, to make it one's own ransom, to appropriate to oneself its atoning efficacy. But if the part of man in this mystical union is limited to faith, this does not yet determine anything as to the nature of the *divine gift* here assured to the believer. To taste pardon, to live again by the Spirit the life of Christ—is this all? We cannot think so. We have seen with what emphasis Jesus returns, at different times in the foregoing discourse, to the idea of the bodily resurrection; He does so again at ver. 54, and in

the most significant way. The life which He communicates to the believer is not, therefore, only His moral nature; it is *His complete life*, physical as well as spiritual, His entire personality. As the grains which the ear contains are only the reappearing of the grain of seed mysteriously multiplied, so believers, sanctified and raised from the dead, are to be only the reproduction, in thousands of living examples, of the glorified Jesus. The principle of this reproduction is undoubtedly spiritual: it is the Spirit which causes Christ to live in us (ch. xiv.-xvi.); but the end of this work is physical: it is the glorious body of the believer, proceeding from His own (1 Cor. xv. 49). Jesus knew, Jesus profoundly felt that He belonged, body and soul, to humanity. It was with this feeling, and not that He might wantonly give offense to His hearers, that He used the terms which are surprising to us in this discourse. The expressions: to eat and drink, are figurative; but the corporeal side of communion with Him is real: "*We are of His body*," says the apostle who is least to be suspected of religious materialism (Eph. v. 30); and to show us clearly that there is no question here of a metaphor intelligible to the first chance scholar, he adds: "*This mystery is great, I speak in respect to Christ and the Church*" (ver. 32). This mystery of our complete union with His person, which in this discourse is expressed in *words*, is precisely that which Jesus desired to express by an *act*, when He instituted the rite of the Lord's Supper. We need not say, therefore, that this discourse alludes to the Lord's Supper, but we must say that the Lord's Supper and this discourse refer to one and the same divine fact, expressed here by a metaphor, there by an emblem. From this point of view, we understand why Jesus makes use here of the word *flesh* and in the institution of the Lord's Supper, of the word *body*. When He instituted the ceremony, He held a loaf in His hand and broke it; now, that which corresponds with this broken bread, was His *body* as an *organism* (σῶμα) broken. In the discourse at Capernaum where the question is only of *nourishment*, according to the analogy of the multiplication of the loaves, Jesus was obliged rather to present His body as *substance* (σάρξ) than as an organism. This perfect propriety of the terms shows the originality and authenticity of the two forms.

There is one question remaining which, from the point of view where we have just taken our position, has only a secondary importance as related to exegesis;—namely, whether already at this period, Jesus thought of instituting the ceremony of the Lord's Supper.<sup>1</sup> He was aware of His approaching death; the news of the murder of John the Baptist had just reawakened in Him the presentiment of it (Matt. xiv. 13), He connected it in His thought with the sacrifice of the Paschal lamb, He knew that this death would be *for the life of the whole world* what the sacrifice of the lamb had been for the existence of the people of Israel. From these premises He might naturally enough be led to the thought of instituting Himself a feast commemorative of His death and of the new covenant, in order thus to replace the feast of the Paschal lamb, the sacrifice of which was the figure of His own. This thought might certainly have arisen on the day when, being deprived of the joy of celebrating the Passover at Jerusalem, and seeing the multitudes flocking towards Him from all sides, He improvised for them a Passover, instead of that which was about to be celebrated in the holy city. It was this feast, offered to His disciples as a *momentary* compensation, which Jesus afterwards transformed, in the Lord's Supper, into a *permanent* institution. And is

<sup>1</sup> On the silence of John with reference to this institution, see chap. xiii.

not this precisely the point of view at which St. John desired to place us, when he said at the beginning, ver. 4: "Now the Passover, the feast of the Jews, was near." This near approach was not altogether foreign to the thought of the other evangelists; it explains the expression, so similar to that of the institution of the Lord's Supper, with which they all begin the narrative of the multiplication of the loaves: "*He took the bread, and gave thanks.*"

Ver. 59. "*These things said Jesus, as he taught in the synagogue, at Capernaum.*" There was a regular meeting in the synagogue on the second, fifth and seventh days of the week (Monday, Thursday and Saturday). The day of the Passover must have fallen in the year 29, on Monday, April 18th (see Chavannes, *Revue de théol.*, third series, Vol. I., p. 209 ff.). If the multiplying of the loaves occurred on the evening before the Passover (ver. 4), the following day, the day on which Jesus pronounced this discourse, must consequently have been Monday, which was a day of meeting. But with what purpose does the evangelist insert this notice here? Does he mean merely to give an historical detail? It is difficult to believe this. *Tholuck* thinks that his design is to account for the numerous audience which the following narrative (*therefore*, ver. 60), implies. Is not this somewhat far-fetched? It seems to us, rather, that after having given the account of so solemn a discourse, the evangelist felt the need of fixing forever the locality of this memorable scene (comp. viii. 20). In order to be sensible of this intention we must, first, observe the absence of an article before *συναγωγή*, not: in the synagogue, but in full synagogal assembly; then, we must connect the objective words *in an assembly* with *teaching*, and *in Capernaum* with *He said*, and paraphrase as follows: "He spoke thus, teaching in full synagogue, at Capernaum." The term *διδάσκων*, *teaching*, which denotes a teaching properly so called, recalls the manner in which Jesus had explained and discussed the Scriptural texts, vv. 31, 35; it is in accord with the solemnity of this scene.

The hearers had questioned, murmured, debated; now it is the better-disposed among them, and even some of the permanent disciples of Jesus, who make themselves the organs of the general discontent.

#### 4. Vv. 60-65.

Ver. 60. "*After having heard him speak thus, many of his disciples said This saying is a hard one; who can listen to it?*" According to *de Wette* and *Meyer*, this exclamation relates to the idea of the bloody death of the Messiah, the great cause of stumbling to the Jews, which had been implied in the preceding declarations; according to *Weiss*, to the overthrow of all their Messianic hopes which resulted from all these discourses; according to *Tholuck* and *Heugstenberg*, to the apparent pride with which Jesus connected the salvation of the world with His own person, according to several of the older writers, *Lampe* and others, to the claim of Jesus to be a personage who had come down from heaven. Undoubtedly all these ideas are expressed in what precedes; but the most striking idea was evi-

dently the obligation to eat His flesh and drink His blood in order to have life, and there was here indeed, also, the most paradoxical and most offensive idea. Grossly understood, it might indeed be revolting even to the disciples, and might force from them the cry: This is going too far; He talks irrationally! The term *μαθηταί*, *disciples*, here denotes persons who attached themselves to Jesus, who followed Him habitually, and who had even broken off from their ordinary occupations in order to accompany Him (ver. 66); it was from among them that Jesus had, a short time before, chosen the Twelve. Some of them were afterwards found undoubtedly among the five hundred of whom Paul speaks (1 Cor. xv. 6). *Σκληρός* (properly, *hard, tough*), does not here signify *obscure* (*Chrysostom, Grotius, Olshausen*), but *difficult to receive*. They think they understand it, but they cannot admit it.—*Τίς δύναται*, “*who has power to . . . ?*”—*Ἀκοίωεν*, “*to listen calmly, without stopping the ears.*”

Vv. 61-63. “*But Jesus, knowing<sup>1</sup> in himself that his disciples murmured at this, said unto them: Does this word offend you? 62. And if you shall see the Son of man ascending where he was before? 63. It is the Spirit that gives life; the flesh profits nothing. The words which I speak<sup>2</sup> unto you are spirit and life.*” As *Lange* remarks, the words “*in himself*” do not exclude the perception of any external signs, but they signify that Jesus had no need of questioning any one of them in order to understand these symptoms. The word *offend*, is to be taken here in the gravest sense, as in Luke vii. 23: to cause to stumble *with respect to faith*.

The words *ἐὰν οὖν* (ver. 62), which we have translated by *and if*, do not depend upon any principal proposition. One must, therefore, be supplied. We may understand, “*What will you then say?*” But this question itself may and must be resolved into one of the two following ones: “*Will not your offense cease then?*” or, on the contrary: “*Will you not then be still more offended?*” This last question is the one which is understood by *de Wette, Meyer* and *Lücke*. According to *Weiss*, this second view is absolutely required by the *οὖν, therefore*; the first would have required *but*: “*But will not your present offense cease?*” True; nevertheless, this second form of the question, if one holds to it, cannot be any more satisfactory. What purpose indeed would it serve to refer them to a coming fact which would offend them still more? We must come to a third supposition which unites the two questions, by passing from the second so as to end with the first. “*If therefore, one day, after you have heard this saying which is so intolerable to you, an event occurs which renders it altogether absurd, will you not then understand that you were mistaken as to its true meaning?*” The apostle calls this event an *ἀναβαίνειν, ascending*. A whole class of interpreters find here the indication of the death of Jesus as the means of His exaltation to the Father (*Lücke, de Wette, Meyer, Reuss, Weiss*). “*It is then indeed, Jesus would say, that your Messianic hopes will be reduced to nothing!*” But are the ideas of

<sup>1</sup> Instead of *εἰδώς δε*, *Σ* reads *εγνώ ουν* and adds *και* before *ειπεν*.

<sup>2</sup> Instead of *λαλω* (*I speak*), which is read by *ΔΓΑ* and *7 Mj.* *Σ B C D K L T U 16 Mnn.* It. Vulg. Orig. read *λελαλησα* (*I have spoken*).

suffering and disappearing identical, then, with that of ascending? When the idea of death on the cross is united with that of the heavenly exaltation of Jesus (iii. 15; xii. 34), the apostle uses the passive term, *ὑψωθῆναι*, to be lifted up. When he desires to present this death from the point of view of the disappearance which will follow it, he says *ὑπάγειν*, to go away (to the Father) but not *ἀναβαίνειν*. When John applies this last term to the exaltation of Jesus xx. 17, he does not mean to speak of His death; for it is after His resurrection. How could the term *ascend* designate the moment of His deepest humiliation? and that in speaking to Jews! Still more, according to all these interpreters, it is the death of Jesus with its consequences which is the *hard saying* at which the disciples are offended; —and yet the new offense, a still greater one, which should form the consummation of the first, is again the death! *Weiss* perceives this contradiction so clearly that, in order to escape it, he supposes that the mention of the death contained in ver. 53 was imported by the evangelist into the discourse of Jesus; the allusion to the great separation of death could have occurred only in this passage. This is to make over the discourse, not to explain it. The only natural and even possible interpretation is that which applies the term *ascend* to the ascension. It is objected that the fact of the ascension is not related by John and that the words: *if you shall see*, do not apply to this fact, since the apostles alone were witnesses of it. But the omission of the ascension in John is explained, like that of the baptism; his narrative ends before the first of these facts, as it begins after the second. Nevertheless John alludes to the one and the other (i. 32 and xx. 17). And as to the word *see*, it is not always applied to the sight of the eyes, but also to that of the understanding; comp. i. 52 “you shall see the angels ascending and descending;” iv. 19: “I see that Thou art a prophet;” but especially Matt. xxvi. 63: “Henceforth *you shall see* the Son of man seated at the right hand of power and coming on the clouds.” This last passage is altogether analogous to ours. In the visible facts of Pentecost and the fall of Jerusalem, the Jews beheld, whether they would or no, the invisible ones, the sitting of Christ on the right hand of God and His return in judgment. As to believers, they have seen and still see through the eyes of the apostles. Jesus Himself, if He foretold these facts, must have clearly foreseen the ascension which is the condition of them. Various details confirm this meaning. In the first place, the present participle *ascending*, which forms a picture (see *Baümlein*); then, the opposition between this term and the term *descending from heaven* which, throughout this whole chapter, has designated the incarnation, as well as the words: *where he was before*, on which, as *Keil* observes, lies precisely the emphasis of the sentence; finally, the parallel in xx. 17. It is evident that this meaning is perfectly suited to the context: “You are offended at the necessity of eating and drinking the blood of a man who is here before you. This thought will seem to you much more unacceptable, when you shall see this same man ascend again into heaven from which He descended before, and His flesh and blood disappear from before your eyes. But at that time you also will be obliged to understand

that the eating and drinking were of an altogether different nature from what you at first supposed." The following verse fully confirms this explanation.

Ver. 63. The first proposition is a general principle, from which they should have started and which would quite naturally exclude the mistake which they commit. *Chrysostom, Luther, Reuss* give to the word *flesh* here the sense of grossly *literal interpretation* and to the word *spirit* that of *figurative interpretation*. But the opposite of the *spirit* in this sense would be *the letter*, rather than *the flesh*; and the word *flesh* cannot be taken here all at once in a different sense from that which it has had throughout the whole preceding discourse. "The Spirit alone gives life," Jesus means to say; "as to the material substance, whether that of the manna, or that of my own body, it is powerless to communicate it." Does this saying exclude the substantial communication of the Lord's body, in the Lord's Supper? No, undoubtedly, since the Lord, as He communicates Himself to believers, through faith, in the sacrament, is *life-giving Spirit*, and the flesh and blood no longer belong to the substance of His glorified body (1 Cor. xv. 50).

From this general principle Jesus infers the true sense of His words. If He said simply: *My words are spirit*, one might understand these words with *Augustine* in the sense: My words are to be understood spiritually. But the second predicate: *and life*, does not allow this explanation. The meaning is therefore: "My words are the incarnation and communication of the Spirit; it is the Spirit who dwells in them and acts through them; and for this reason they communicate life" (according to the first clause of the verse). From this spiritual and life-giving nature of His words results the manner in which they are to be interpreted. The Alexandrian reading: "the words which *I have spoken*," is adopted as unquestionable by *Tischendorf, Westcott, Weiss, Keil*, etc., on the evidence of the most ancient Mss. And one seems to be setting oneself obstinately against the evidence in preferring to it the received reading: "the words which *I speak* (in general)," which has in its favor only the St. Gall MS. and nine others of nearly the same time (9th century). My conviction is, nevertheless, that this is indeed the true reading. The first reading would restrict the application of these words to the sayings which Jesus has just uttered on this same day, while the pronoun *ἐγώ, I*, by making the nature of the sayings depend on the character of Him who utters them, gives to this affirmation a permanent application: "The words which a being such as *I am*, spiritual and living, utters, are necessarily spirit and life." *Weiss* does not appear to me to have succeeded in accounting for this pronoun *ἐγώ*, when he adopts the Alexandrian reading.

Ver. 64, 65. "But there are among you some that believe not. For Jesus<sup>1</sup> knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who it was that should betray him; 65 and he said: For this cause have I said unto you, that no man can come unto me, except it be given him by my Father." To the exclamation: *This saying is a hard one*, Jesus had replied: "It is hard only

<sup>1</sup> Instead of *Ἰησοῦς*, *Χ* reads *ο σωτηρ* (the Saviour).

so far as you wrongly understand it." And now He unveils the cause of this want of understanding. Even among them, His disciples, apparently believers, there is a large number who are not true believers. The expression *τινές* does not so far limit the number of these false believers as the French [or English] word *some*; comp. Rom. iii. 3; xi. 17, and Heb. iii. 16, where this pronoun is applied to the whole mass of the disobedient and unbelieving Jewish nation. The word *τινές* designates any part whatever, whether great or small, of the whole. The evangelist by means of a fact gives the reason, in the second part of the verse, for the declaration pronounced in the first; this fact is that Jesus knows them even to the foundation, and this from the beginning. The word *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*, from the beginning, applies undoubtedly, as *Lücke, Meyer, Westcott* think, to the earliest times of Jesus' ministry, when He set Himself to the work of grouping around Himself a circle of permanent disciples (xv. 27, xvi. 4; Acts i. 21, 22), or, what amounts nearly to the same thing, to the beginning of the relation of Jesus to each one of them (*Tholuck, Westcott, Keil*); He discerned immediately the nature of the aspirations which brought them to Him (ii. 22, 23). *Lange and Weiss* think that the term *beginning* designates the first appearance of the unbelief itself. *Chrysostom and Bengel* apply it to the moment when the hearers had begun to murmur on this very day. These last explanations are quite unnatural. *Kai, and*: and even, or: and in particular. The expression: *who it was who should*, is written, not from the standpoint of a fatalistic predestination, but simply from that of the accomplished fact (ver. 71). It follows undoubtedly from this word of John that Jesus did not choose Judas without understanding that, if there was to be a traitor among His disciples, it would be he; but not that He had chosen him in order that he should betray Him. He might hope to gain the victory over the egoistic and earthly aspirations which brought this man, like so many others, to Him. The privileged place which He accorded to him might be a means of gaining him, as also it might end in a deeper fall, if he trampled this grace under foot. As *Keil* says, "God constantly puts men in positions where their sin, if it is not overcome, must necessarily reach maturity. And God uses it then to serve the accomplishment of His plan." Still more, shall we not go so far as to say that the very fall in which this relation was to end might become the terrible means of finally breaking down the pride of this Titanic nature? The moment when Judas, receiving the fatal morsel from the hand of Jesus, must have felt all the greatness of his crime, might have become for him the moment of repentance and of salvation. "If," says *Riggenbach (Leben des Herrn Jesu, p. 366)*, "in that night of prayer when the choice of the Twelve was prepared for (Luke vi. 12), the thoughts of the Lord Jesus were again and again brought back to this man, and if, while very clearly discerning his want of uprightness, He was obliged to recognize in this the signal from the Father, what shall we have to say? Literally the narrator says: "For He knew . . . *who they are* who do not believe and *who is* he who shall betray Him;" so far does he carry himself back with vividness to the moment when all this occurred.

The *καὶ ἔλεγεν*, *and he said*, leads us to suppose a moment of silence here, filled with the sorrowful reflection which the evangelist afterwards communicates to us. The *διὰ τοῦτο*, *for this cause*, refers to the expression: *some who do not believe*. "It is precisely to this that I wished to turn your attention when I said to you." A man may declare and believe himself His disciple without truly believing, because he joins himself to Him under the sway of motives which do not proceed from the teaching of the Father (ver. 45).

Without this divine and inward preparation, even in the most favorable position faith remains impossible. The quotation is not literal, any more than in the other cases where Jesus quotes Himself (vi. 36). In ver. 37, it was the coming believer who *was given* to Jesus; here it *is given* to him to come. *Westcott* observes correctly that the two elements, divine and human, appear here, the first in the word *is given*, the second in the word *come*. This saying of Jesus was a farewell; those to whom it was addressed understood it. Even after the day when the popular enthusiasm had reached its culminating point, the Galilean work of Jesus seemed as if destroyed; it presented the aspect of a rich harvest on which a hail-storm has beaten.

Ver. 66. "*From that moment<sup>1</sup> many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him.*" In the picture which the Synoptics have drawn for us of the Galilean ministry,—particularly in that of St. Luke,—Jesus shows Himself often preoccupied with the necessity of making a selection among those crowds who followed Him without comprehending the serious character of the step. Comp. Luke viii. 9 ff.; ix. 23 ff.; xiv. 25 ff. Jesus preferred by far a little nucleus of men established in faith and resolved to accept the self-denials which it imposed, to those multitudes whose bond of union with His person was only an apparent one. But there was more than this: all His work would have been in danger if the spirit which was manifested on the preceding day had gained the ascendant among His adherents already so numerous. It was necessary to remove everything which, in this mass, was not decided to go with Him on the pathway of the crucifixion and towards a wholly spiritual kingdom. We can, from this point of view, explain the method pursued by Him in the foregoing scene. The words by which He had characterized the nature and privileges of faith were adapted to attach the true believers to Him more closely, but also to repel all those whom the instincts of a carnal Messianic hope brought to Him. The danger which His work had just incurred had revealed to Him the necessity of purifying His infant Church. Ver. 66 shows us this end attained, so far as concerned the group of disciples who most nearly surrounded the apostolic company. *Ἐκ τούτου* may be taken in a temporal sense: *from this moment* (*de Wette*), or in the logical sense: *for this reason* (*Meyer, Weiss*, etc.). For this second sense classical examples may be cited. The passage xix. 12 determines nothing. I would understand: *since this fact*, which includes both the time (from this

<sup>1</sup> ⚪ D add here οὖν (*therefore*).

day) and its contents (that which had just occurred). The words ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὰ ὄπισω, *went back*, include more than simple defection; they denote the return of these people to their ordinary occupations, which they had abandoned in order continuously to follow the Lord. The imperfect περιπατοῦν indicates a fact of a certain continuance; they no longer took part in His wandering kind of life (vii. 1). It was in consequence of this prolonged rupture that the following conversation took place. Jesus, far from being discouraged by this result, sees in it a salutary sifting process which He wished even to introduce into the midst of the circle of the Twelve; for here also He discerns the presence of impure elements.

Vv. 67-69. "Jesus said therefore unto the Twelve: And you, you will not also go away? 68. Simon Peter answered<sup>1</sup> him: Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast words of eternal life; 69 and us for us, we have believed and have known that thou art the Holy One of God."<sup>2</sup> At the sight of this increasing desertion (ὄν), Jesus addresses Himself to the Twelve themselves. But who are these Twelve of whom John speaks as personages perfectly well known to the readers? He has, up to this point, only spoken of the calling of five disciples, in chap. i.; he has mentioned, besides, the existence of an indefinite and considerably numerous circle of adherents. In this example we lay our finger on the mistake of those who claim that John is ignorant of, or tacitly denies, all the facts which he does not himself relate. This expression: *the Twelve*, which is repeated in vv. 70, 71, implies and confirms the story of Luke vi. 12 ff.; Mark iii. 13 ff., which John has omitted as known; comp. the ἐξελεξάμην (ver. 70) with the ἐκλεξάμενος of Luke. Jesus' question expects a negative answer (μὴ). So *de Wette*, *Meyer*, *Weiss*, give to it this melancholy sense: "You would not also leave me?" Here, as it seems to me, and whatever *Weiss* and *Düsterdieck* may say, is an example of the errors into which grammatical pedantry may lead. Far from having the plaintive tone, this question breathes the most manly energy. Jesus has just seen the larger part of his earlier disciples leaving Him; it seems, therefore, that He must hold so much the more firmly to the Twelve, the last human supports of His work; and yet He Himself opens the door for them. Only, as he certainly does not wish to induce them to leave Him, and it is only a permission that He intends to give them, He cannot use the expression οὐχ ὑμεῖς θέλετε, *will you not*, which would be a positive invitation to depart. He limits Himself, therefore, to saying: *you surely will not . . . ?* a form which implies this idea: "But if you wish to go, you are free." It must not be forgotten, that, in the use of the particles, there are shades of feeling which prevent our subjecting their meaning to such strict rules as those which philology sometimes claims to establish. The *καί* before ὑμεῖς, *you also*, emphatically distinguishes the apostles from all the other disciples. At which one of them did Jesus aim, as He discharged this arrow? The close

<sup>1</sup> Mj. (N B C etc.), omit οὐν.

<sup>2</sup> The T. R. reads with 13 Mj. (Γ Δ Α Π etc.) ἰπτερικε Syr.: ο χριστος ο υιος του θεου

του ζωντος (the Christ, the Son of the living God); Syneur Itperique omit του ζωντος. N B C D L; ο αγιος του θεου (the Holy One of God).

of the conversation will give us the answer. Peter hastens to take up the discourse, and, without troubling himself, perchance, enough to find out whether his feeling is shared by all his colleagues, he makes himself their mouthpiece; it is exactly the Peter of the Synoptics and the Acts, the bold confessor. His answer (ver. 68) expresses these two facts: the deep void which all other teaching has left in his soul, and the life-giving richness which he has found in that of Jesus. This confession of Peter is, as it were, an echo of the declaration of Jesus, ver. 63: "*My words are spirit and life*;" but it is not a mechanical imitation of it; it is the result of a personal experience already gained (ver. 69). By substituting "*the words*" for "*words*" our translations have transformed the ejaculation of immediate feeling into a dogmatic formula.

Ver. 69. The pronoun *ἡμεῖς*, *we*, sets the apostles in marked contrast with the disciples who had just deserted Jesus. The verbs in the perfect tense *have believed, known*, indicate things gained for the future and which are not necessary to be reconsidered. Jesus may declare in their presence the most surprising things; it matters not; the faith which they have in Him and the knowledge which they have of Him cause them in advance to accept all. There is a certain knowledge which precedes faith (1 John iv. 16); but there is also a knowledge which follows it and which has a more inward and profound character (Phil. iii. 10); it is of this latter that Peter here speaks. Under the power of an immediate impression they—John, Andrew and himself—had proclaimed Jesus as the Christ (i. 42, 50), and from that time they had, through a daily experience, recognized and established the truth of that first impression. The substance of Peter's profession is formulated somewhat differently in the Alexandrian and Byzantine readings. The expression: *Son of the living God*, in the second, is connected with the whole contents of the chapter; comp. ver. 57: "*The living Father*." But what renders it suspicious is its resemblance to Peter's confession in Matt. xvi. 16. At the first glance, the designation: *the Holy One of God*, of the Alexandrian authorities is less easily justified in this context. But it is nevertheless connected with the idea expressed in ver. 27: *He whom the Father, God, has sealed*. The unexceptionable divine seal, by which the apostles had recognized Jesus as the Messiah was not especially His acts of power; it was His holiness. The term: *Holy One of God*, "set apart from the rest of men by His consecration," is not a Messianic designation either in the Old Testament or in the New Testament. It is the demons who used it the first time (Mark i. 24 and Luke iv. 34). They were led to it by the feeling of the contrast between Christ and themselves, impure spirits; Peter and the apostles, by that of sympathy. Comp. Luke i. 35; Acts iv. 27; Apoc. iii. 7.

Vv. 70, 71. "*Jesus answered them: Is it not I who have chosen you the Twelve? And one of you is a devil! Now he spoke of Judas, the son of*

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  rejects *τους* and *εις*.

<sup>2</sup> B C G L read *Ἰσκαριωτου* (agreeing with *Σιμωνος*) instead of *Ἰσκαριωτην* which is read

by T. R. with 11 Mjj. etc.— $\aleph$  reads *απο Καρωτου*, and 3 Mm. *απο Καριωτου*.—D It<sup>alg</sup> *Σκαριωθ.*—Syr.: *Iscariot*.

*Simon, Iscariot, for he it was that should betray him, he, one*<sup>1</sup> *of the Twelve."* Peter had spoken in the name of all; Jesus tears off the veil which this profession, apparently unanimous, threw over the secret unbelief of one of their number. Not only does He wish thereby to make Judas understand that He is not his dupe and prevent the offense which the thought that their Master had been wanting in discernment might cause to the other apostles. But He desires, especially, to awaken Judas' conscience and to induce him to break with the false position in which he seems to persist in continuing. Jesus addresses in His answer, not Peter alone, but all (*αὐτοῖς, them*). He brings strikingly together (*καί*) these two facts so shockingly contradictory: the mark of love which He has given to them all by their election and the ungrateful perfidy of one of them. The words *ἐξ ὑμῶν* have the emphasis: "From among you, chosen by myself." The word *διάβολος*, does not mean merely diabolical, or child of the devil (viii. 44); it denotes a second Satan, an incarnation of the spirit of Satan. The word of address: *Satan*, addressed to Peter in the scene at Cæsarea Philippi, makes him also an organ of Satan. But as for him, he was so only momentarily and through an ill-directed love. This Judas, to whom Jesus had just opened the door, nevertheless remains, covering himself with the mask of a hypocritical fidelity and accepting as his own Peter's profession. The term which Jesus had employed expressed already the deep indignation which was occasioned in Him by this persistency of Judas and the foreseeing of the hateful end to which this course of action must infallibly lead him.

Ver. 71. At the moment, no one of the disciples, unless perhaps John and Judas himself, understood to whom these words applied. The almost certain etymology of the word *Ἰσκαριώτης* is Ish-Kerioth, *man of Kerioth*; this was the name of a town in the tribe of Judah (Josh. xv. 25). According to all appearance, the apostle was the only one who was a native of Judea, that country hostile to Jesus. *Hengstenberg* prefers the etymology *איש שקרים, man of falsehoods*. John would thus anticipate the use of a name which could have been given him only after his crime; a supposition which is unnatural. The Alexandrian reading makes this surname an epithet of the father of Judas; the same is the case in xiii. 26. In xiv. 22, this word is without any variant and applies to Judas himself. It might be applied to the father and the son. The verb *ἤμελλεν* simply means, starting from the point of view of the accomplished fact: "He it was to whom it should happen . . ." The last words bring out the monstrous contrast between his position and his conduct.

From the beginning, a gnawing worm had been fastened to the root of the Galilean faith. John had characterized this evil by the words: *πάντα ἑώρακότεις . . . "having seen all that he did"* (iv. 45). And Jesus, with the same feeling, had said (iv. 48): "*Unless ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe.*" The sixth chapter brings before our eyes the premature falling of the fruit of this tree, which had for a time presented such fair appear-

<sup>1</sup> T. R. reads *ων* after *εις* with 13 Mj. Mnn. It. Vulg. Cop. against B C D L Syr. which reject it.

ances. If one wishes to understand this crisis, it is enough for him to cast a glance at the Christianity of to-day. It declares and thinks itself Christian, but material instincts have, more and more, the preponderance over religious and moral needs. Soon the Gospel will not answer any longer to the aspirations of the masses. The words: "*You have seen me and believe not,*" will have their application to them on a still vaster scale; and the time will come when the great defection of Christendom will, for a time, reproduce the Galilean catastrophe. Our epoch is the true commentary on the sixth chapter of the Gospel of St. John.

Objections have been made to the authenticity of these discourses. Critics have alleged their unintelligibility for the hearers (*Strauss, Leben Jesu*, vol. I., 2d part, pp. 680, 681) and the similarity of the dialogue to the one in chap. iv. (*Ibid.* p. 680). Comp. especially, ver. 34 with iv. 15; ver. 27 with iv. 13, 14. With reference to this second point we answer. 1. That the ever-renewed collision between the heavenly thought of Jesus and the carnal minds which it was trying to elevate even to itself must, at each time, introduce analogous phases; and 2. That it is not difficult to point out characteristic differences between chap. iv. and chap. vi. The chief one is this: While the Samaritan woman suffers herself to be transported to the celestial sphere whither Jesus would attract her, the Galileans, elevated for a moment, soon fall again to the earth, and break decisively with Him who declares that He has nothing to offer them for the satisfaction of their gross religious materialism.

As to the *first* point, we think that we have here an excellent opportunity to convince ourselves of the authenticity of the discourses of the fourth Gospel. If there is any one of them which can be accused of presenting the mystical character to which the name Johannean is often given, it is certainly this one. And yet, how without this discourse can we explain the great historical fact of the Galilean crisis which is connected with it in our narrative. This decisive event in the history of Jesus' ministry is not called in question by any one, and yet it is inseparable from the discourse which caused it! This discourse, moreover, is naturally connected with its starting point and has a clearly graduated progress. Jesus here declares to the Jews: 1. That they must seek after a higher food than the bread of the day before; 2. That this food is Himself; and 3. That, in order to appropriate it to oneself, one must go so far as to eat His flesh and drink His blood. This gradation is natural: it presents itself as historically necessary, the fact being given which served as its point of departure. Even the incomprehensibility of the last part for the mass of the hearers becomes one of the factors of the double result which Jesus desired to attain; the purification of the circle of His disciples and even of that of His apostles, and the radical rupture with the Messianic illusions on which the multitudes gathered around Him were still feeding.

As to the relation of the profession of the apostles, ch. vi., to that of Cesarea Philippi (Matt. xvi. 13 ff.; Mark viii. 27 ff.; Luke ix. 18 ff.), it seems to me that it is difficult to imagine two questionings of Jesus, as

well as two responses of the disciples, so similar to one another nearly at the same time. There is nothing to prevent our placing between the scene at Capernaum and the confession of Peter in our chapter an interval of some weeks. The *ἐκ τούτου*, *from this time* (ver. 66), easily allows it, and we have thus the necessary time for locating the matter contained (in Matt. and Mark) between the multiplication of the loaves and this solemn conversation of Jesus with His disciples (Matt. xiv. 34-xvi. 12; Mark vi. 53-viii. 26). As for Luke, he is still more easily put in accord with John, since omitting all the intermediate passages, he directly connects the conversation of Jesus and Peter's profession with the multiplication of the loaves (ix. 17, 18). No doubt, the answer of Peter is somewhat differently expressed in Matthew ("Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God") and in John ("Thou art the Holy One of God"); and Westcott finds in this difference a sufficient reason for distinguishing the two scenes. But in the Synoptics also the answer differs (Mark: "Thou art the Christ;" Luke: "Thou art the Christ of God"), a proof that we should not fasten our attention here on the terms, but on the sense: the Messianic dignity of Jesus (in opposition to the function of a simple prophet or a forerunner; comp. Matt. xvi. 14 ff.). For myself, I cannot comprehend how Jesus, after having obtained from the mouth of Peter either the profession reported by Matthew, or that of which John speaks, should almost at the same time have also asked a new one.

### THIRD SECTION.

#### VII. 1-VIII. 59

##### THE STRIFE AT ITS HIGHEST STAGE OF INTENSITY AT JERUSALEM.

Seven months had elapsed without any appearance of Jesus at Jerusalem. The exasperation of the rulers, whose murderous character John had recognized from the beginning (v. 16, 18), had for a moment become calm; but the fire was ever smouldering under the ashes. At the first appearance of Jesus in the capital, the flame could not fail to burst forth anew, and with a redoubled violence.

We may divide this section into three parts :

1. Before the feast : vii. 1-13.
2. During the feast : vii. 14-36.
3. End and results of the feast : vii. 37-viii. 59.

#### I.—Before the Feast : vii. 1-13.

Ver. 1. "And after this,<sup>1</sup> Jesus continued to sojourn in Galilee: for he would not sojourn in Judea, because the Jews were seeking to put Him to death." The situation described in this first verse is the continuation of that of

<sup>1</sup> Kai (and) is omitted by  $\aleph$  D Itplerique Sah. the beginning of the verse, and not after  
Syr.—<sup>9</sup> Mij. ( $\aleph$  B C etc.), place *μετα ταυτα* at *λησους*.

which the picture has been drawn in vi. 1, 2. Hence the *καί, and*, placed at the beginning; comp. vi. 1. If he does not any further mention the numerous body of attendants of which he had spoken at the beginning of chap. vi., it is perhaps owing to the general desertion which had temporarily followed the scene related in the sixth chapter. But he brings out more forcibly the persistence with which, during so long a period, Jesus limited His journeyings to Galilee. The term *περιπατεῖν*, *to go and come*, characterizes by a single word that ministry of itinerant evangelization which the Synoptics describe in detail. The imperfect tenses make prominent the continuance of this state of things. The sense of the words: *He sojourned in Galilee*, is rather negative than positive: "He did not go out of Galilee." The last words of the verse recall the state in which the preceding visit of Jesus had left the minds of men in Jerusalem (chap. v.), and thus prepare the way for the following narrative. In one sense, everything is fragmentary, in another, everything is intimately connected in the Johannean narration.

Let us here cast a glance at the contents of the Synoptic narrative up to the moment which we have reached in the narrative of John.

To our sixth chapter corresponds precisely the period contained in Matt. xiv. 13-xvi. 28, and in Mark vi. 30-viii. 38, including the multiplication of the loaves, the conversation with the Pharisees on washings and the cleanness of meats, the journey to the northwest as far as Phœnicia, (the Canaanitish woman), the return through Decapolis with the second multiplication of loaves, the return on the western shore of the lake, a new excursion on the opposite shore, together with the arrival at Bethsaida; finally, an excursion to the north of Palestine, with the conversation at Cæsarea Philippi. Thus we reach the moment parallel with the end of the sixth chapter and the beginning of the seventh chapter of John. It is October. Here are placed in the Synoptics the events which precede and accompany the return from Upper Galilee to Capernaum, the Transfiguration, the conversations on the approaching rejection of Jesus, the dispute among the disciples and the arrival at Capernaum (Matt. xvii. 1-xviii. end; Mark ix.). Then Mark (x. 1) and Matthew (xx. 1) relate the final departure from Galilee to Judea. This cannot be the journey to the feast of Tabernacles in John vii., as we shall show. This journey (in John) is omitted, like all the others, by the Synoptics; the final departure from Galilee indicated by them is certainly a fact *posterior* to the brief journey to Jerusalem described by John in chap. vii. Luke, as we have seen, connects the conversation at Cæsarea (ix. 17, 18) directly with the first multiplication of loaves. Then he recounts nearly the same facts as the two other Synoptical writers, the Transfiguration, the healing of the lunatic child, the conversation respecting the approaching sufferings and the return to Capernaum (ix. 18-50); finally he passes, like the other two, from this point to the final departure for Jerusalem (ix. 51.)

Ver. 2. "*But the feast of the Jews, called that of Tabernacles, was at hand.*" This feast was celebrated in October: six full months, therefore, according to John himself, separate this story from the one preceding, without his

mentioning a single one of the facts which we have just enumerated, and which filled this entire half-year. His intention, then, is certainly not to relate a complete history, and his silence with respect to any fact whatever cannot be interpreted as a proof of ignorance or as an implicit denial of it. The feast of Tabernacles, called in Maccabees and in Josephus, as here, *σκηνοπηγία*, was celebrated for eight days, reckoning from the fifteenth day of the seventh month (Tisri). During this time, the people dwelt in tents, made of leafy branches, on the roofs of the houses, in the streets and squares, and even on the sides of the roads around Jerusalem. The Jews thus renewed every year the remembrance of the forty years during which their fathers had lived in tents in the wilderness. The city and its environs resembled a camp of pilgrims. The principal ceremonies of the feast had reference to the miraculous blessings of which Israel had been the object during that long and painful pilgrimage of the desert. A libation which was made every morning in the temple, recalled to mind the waters which Moses had caused to spring forth from the rock. Two candelabra, lighted at evening in the court, represented the luminous cloud which had given light to the Israelites during the nights. To the seven days of the feast, properly so called, the law added an eighth, with which was perhaps connected, according to the ingenious supposition of *Lange*, the remembrance of the entrance into the promised land. Josephus calls this feast the most sacred and greatest of the Israelitish festivals. But, as it was also designed to celebrate the end of all the harvestings of the year, the people gave themselves up to rejoicings which easily degenerated into license, and which caused it to be compared by Plutarch to the feasts of Bacchus. It was the last of the great legal feasts of the year; as Jesus had not gone, this year, either to the Passover-feast or to that of Pentecost, it might be presumed that He would go to this feast. For it was assumed that every one would celebrate at least one of these three principal feasts at Jerusalem. Hence the *therefore* of the following verse.

Ver. 3-5. "*His brethren therefore said to him: Depart hence and go into Judea, that thy disciples also may behold*<sup>1</sup> *the works which thou doest; 4 for no man does*<sup>2</sup> *any work in secret, while seeking after*<sup>3</sup> *fame; if thou really doest such works, manifest thyself to the world. 5. For even his brethren did not believe*<sup>4</sup> *on him.*" We take the expression "*Jesus' brethren,*" in the strict sense. Comp. on this question Vol. I., pp. 357-361. At the head of these brethren was undoubtedly James, who was afterwards the first director of the flock at Jerusalem (Acts xii. 17; xv. 13; xxi. 18; Gal. i. 19; ii. 9). The exhortation which they address to Jesus is inspired neither by a too impatient zeal for the glory of their brother (*Hengstenberg, Lange*) nor by the malignant desire of seeing Him fall into the hands of His enemies (*Euthymius*). They are, beyond doubt, neither so good nor so bad. They are perplexed with regard to the claims of Jesus; on the one hand, they

<sup>1</sup> Instead of *θεωρησωσι*, B D L M Δ read *θεωρησουσι*; N *θεωρουσι*.

<sup>2</sup> Instead of *ποιει*, N b: *ποιων*.

<sup>3</sup> Instead of *αυτος*, B D d Cop. read *αυτο*.

<sup>4</sup> D L read *επιστευσαν* (*believed*).

cannot deny the extraordinary facts of which they are every day the witnesses; on the other, they cannot decide to regard as the Messiah this man whom they are accustomed to treat on terms of the most perfect familiarity. They desire, therefore, to see Him withdraw from the equivocal situation which He creates for Himself and in which He places them all by keeping Himself so persistently at a distance from Jerusalem. If He is truly the Messiah, why indeed should He fear to make His appearance before more competent judges than the ignorant Galileans. His place is at Jerusalem. Is not the capital the theatre on which the Messiah should play His part, and the place where the official recognition of His mission should be accomplished? The approaching feast, which seems to impose on Jesus an obligation to go to Jerusalem, appears to them the favorable moment for a decisive step. There is a certain analogy between this summons of the brethren and the request of Mary, chap. ii., as there will be also between the manner in which the Lord acts and His conduct at the wedding in Cana.

What do the brethren mean by the expression "*thy disciples*" (ver. 3)? It seems that they apply this name only to the adherents of Jesus in Judea. And this was indeed their thought, perhaps, in view of the fact that there only had Jesus properly founded a school similar to that of John the Baptist, by baptizing like him; comp. iv. 1: "*The Pharisees had heard that Jesus was making and baptizing more disciples than John the Baptist.*" All this had been told and repeated in Galilee; a great stir had been made respecting these numerous adherents of Jesus in Judea and at Jerusalem, at whose head might even be found members of the Sanhedrim. His brethren remind Him of these earlier successes in Judea, and this with the more timeliness because, since the scene of chap. vi., the larger part of His disciples in Galilee had abandoned Him, and He was now surrounded only by a fluctuating multitude. They mean, therefore: "These Messianic works which thou dost lavish upon these crowds, without any result,—go then, at length, and do them in the places where it is said that thou hast formed a school, and where thou wilt have witnesses more worthy of such a spectacle and more capable of drawing a serious conclusion from it." It is not necessary, therefore, to supply, with *Lücke* and others, *ἐκεῖ*: "*thy disciples there,*" or to explain, as *Hengstenberg* and *Meyer* do: "*thy disciples in the entire nation, who will come to the feast.*" John must certainly have added a word in order to indicate either the one or the other of these meanings. The term *μαθηταί*, *disciples*, is taken here by the brethren in a sense which is slightly emphatic and ironical.

*Lücke* has perfectly rendered the construction of ver. 4 by a Latin phrase: *Nemo enim clam sua agit idemque cupit celebrare esse*. There exists no man who works in secret and at the same time aspires to make for himself a name. *ἄνθρωπος* refers to this hypothetical subject of the verb *ποιεῖ*, *does*, whose real existence the word *no one* afterwards denies. The copula *καί*, *and*, strongly sets forth the internal contradiction between such a claim and such conduct (comp. the *καί* of vi. 36). *Ἐν παρήρῳ* is used

here, whatever Meyer may say, in the same sense as in xi. 54 and Col. ii. 15: *in public*. From the idea of speaking *boldly* we easily pass to that of acting *openly* (Keil). The sense given by Meyer: "No one acts in secret and wishes at the same time to be a man of frankness," is inadmissible. By saying *ei, if*, the brethren do not precisely call in question the reality of the miracles of Jesus. This *ei* is logical; it signifies *if really*. Only they ask for judges more competent than themselves to decide on the value of these works. And for this end it is necessary that he should advance or retreat. Certainly, speaking absolutely, they were right: the Messianic question could not be decided in Galilee. The choice of the time remained; this was the point which Jesus reserved for Himself. By *κόσμος, the world*, the brethren evidently mean the great theatre of human existence, such as they knew it, Jerusalem. The style of ver. 4 has a peculiarly Hebraic stamp: these are the words of the brethren of Jesus taken as if from their lips. Comp. the analogous construction in 1 Sam. xx. 2.

Hengstenberg, Lange, Keil and Westcott endeavor to reconcile ver. 5 with the supposition that two or three of Jesus' brothers were apostles. Hengstenberg remarks first that these words may refer to Joses, the fourth brother of Jesus, and then to the husbands of His sisters. Perceiving indeed the improbability of this understanding of the matter, the others weaken as far as possible the force of the words: *They did not believe*. It is only a partial and momentary want of faith, or, according to Westcott, an effect of the insufficient influence exerted by their faith on their thought and their conduct: But this relative unbelief, as they call it, does not account for the absolute expression: *They did not believe on him*; especially when strengthened, as it is, by the word *neither*, by which John brings the brethren of Jesus into the category of all the other unbelieving Galileans. The reading of D L: *They did not believe* (aorist), is certainly a correction, intended to facilitate an interpretation of this sort. Moreover, what follows excludes this weakened meaning. How could Jesus address to His brothers, being *apostles*, those severe words: "*The world cannot hate you*" (ver. 7), while in xv. 19 He says to the apostles: "*If you were of the world, the world would love its own; but because you are not of the world . . . , therefore the world hates you.*" It certainly follows, therefore, from this remark, that even at this time, six months before the last Passover, Jesus' own brothers did not acknowledge Him as the Messiah. But, divided between the impression which His miracles produced upon them and the insuperable doubts of their carnal minds, they eagerly desired to reach at length a solution. This attitude is very natural; it accords with the role which is ascribed to them in the Synoptical narrative; comp. Mark iii. The perfect sincerity of John's story appears from the frankness with which he expresses himself respecting this fact which was so humbling to Jesus (see *Tholuck*). We may well remark also, with the same author, that these words of the brethren (vv. 3, 4) contain the complete indirect confirmation of the entire representation of the Galilean ministry which is traced by the Synoptics.

Vv. 6-8. "Jesus therefore<sup>1</sup> says to them: My time is not yet<sup>2</sup> come; but your time is always ready. 7. The world cannot hate you; but it hates me, because I<sup>3</sup> bear testimony concerning it<sup>3</sup> that its works are evil. 8. Go ye up to the<sup>4</sup> feast, I go not<sup>5</sup> up to this feast, because my time is not yet fulfilled." The meaning of the demand of the brethren of Jesus was that He should present Himself at last at Jerusalem as the Messiah, and obtain there the recognition of that dignity, which could not be refused Him, if He was really what He claimed to be. Jesus could not explain to His brethren the reasons which prevented Him from deferring to their wish. If He had wished to answer altogether openly, He would have said to them: "What you ask of me would be the signal of my death; but it is not yet time for me to leave the earth." Of this explanation, into which Jesus does not wish to enter, He gives a hint. The words: *The world hates me*, sufficiently express the prudence which is required of Him. The term *καρπός*, favorable moment, must be understood in a manner sufficiently broad to make it possible to apply it both to Jesus (ver. 6a) and to His brethren (ver. 6b). It denotes therefore the moment of showing oneself publicly as one is: for the brethren, as faithful Jews, by going up to this feast; for Jesus, as Messiah, by manifesting Himself as such at one of the great feasts of His people, at Jerusalem.

The seventh verse explains this contrast between His position and theirs. There is a certain irony in the reason alleged by Jesus: "Your works and your words are not sufficiently out of harmony with those of the world to make it possible for you to provoke its hatred." It is otherwise in His case, who by His words and His life does not cease to unveil its deep depravity concealed under the outward show of Pharisaic righteousness (v. 42, 44, 47).

Ver. 8 draws the practical consequence of this contrast. The meaning of the reply of Jesus is naturally in accord with that of the question, and especially of the words: "Manifest thyself to the world." Jesus well knew that He must one day make the great Messianic demonstration which His brethren demanded, but He also knew that the time for it was not yet come. His earthly work was not accomplished. Moreover, it was not at the feast of Tabernacles, it was at that of the Passover that He must die. Hence, the special emphasis with which He says in the second clause, no longer as when speaking of His brethren: "Go up to the feast" (comp. the reading of B D, etc.), but "to this feast," or even "this particular feast." If the reply of Jesus is thus placed in close connection with the request of His brethren, it is no longer necessary, in order to justify it, to read with so many of the MSS.: "I go not yet up," instead of: "I go not up." The first reading is manifestly a correction by means of which an attempt was early made to remove the apparent contradiction between

<sup>1</sup> N D omit *ovv*.

<sup>2</sup> N: *ov* instead of *ovπω*.

<sup>3</sup> N alone omits *εγω* and *περι αυτου*.

<sup>4</sup> B D K L T X II 15 Mnn. Italic Cop. reject the first *ταυτην* (*this feast*) which is read

by T. R. with 12 Mjj. (among which N) Mnn. Italic Syr.

<sup>5</sup> T. R. reads *ovπω* (*not yet*) with B E F G H L S T U X Γ Δ Λ Mnn. Italic Syriac *ovk* (*not*) is read in N D K M II Italic Vulg. Cop. Syreur.

the reply of Jesus and His subsequent action (ver. 10). The reading, *not yet*, is not only suspicious for this reason; the meaning of it is altogether false. The antithesis which engages the thought of Jesus when He says: "I go not up to this feast," is not the contrast between this day and some days later; it is that between *this feast* and *another subsequent feast*. What proves this, is the reason which He alleges: *For my time is not yet fulfilled* (ver. 8). The condition of things had not changed when Jesus went up to Jerusalem a few days afterwards. This very solemn expression, therefore, could only apply to the period of time which still remained before the future feast of the Passover, the destined limit of His earthly life. The *not yet* which was well adapted to ver. 6, was wrongly introduced into our verse instead of *not*; comp. for this solemn sense of the word to *be fulfilled* Luke ix. 31, 51; Acts ii. 1, etc. As Jesus rejected at Cana a solicitation of His mother aiming substantially at the same result as the present summons of His brethren, and yet soon gave her satisfaction of her desire in a much more moderate way, so Jesus begins here by refusing to go up to Jerusalem in the sense in which He was urged to do so (that of manifesting Himself to the world), in order to go up afterwards in a wholly different sense. The conversion of His brethren, a few months afterwards, proves that the subsequent events were for them the satisfactory commentary on this saying, and that there did not remain in their minds the slightest doubt respecting the *veracity* and moral character of their brother. The following are the other explanations which have been given of this saying of Jesus. 1. That of *Chrysostom*, adopted by *Lücke*, *Olshausen*, *Tholuck*, *Stier*: "I go not now," deriving a *viv* (*now*), to be supplied, from the present ἀναβαίω (*I go*). This ellipsis is not only needless, but false. Jesus, as we have seen, makes no allusion to a nearly approaching journey to Jerusalem, which perhaps was not yet even determined upon in His own mind. 2. *Meyer* holds that Jesus, in the interval between ver. 8 and ver. 10, formed a resolution which was altogether new; *Gess*, in like manner: God did not give Him the order until later (v. 19). *Reuss*, nearly the same: Jesus reserved to Himself the liberty of acting according to His own desire, without consulting any one. *Weiss*: In accordance with prudence, Jesus was obliged to say: I go not up; but as His father gave Him afterwards the order to go, a promise was given to protect Him; and this is what took place. All this is very well conceived. But if Jesus did not yet know the Divine will, should He have said so positively: *I go not up*. This was to declare Himself far too categorically. He should have answered more vaguely: "I know not yet whether I shall go up; do you go up; nothing prevents your doing so." 3. Others finally, as *Bengel* and *Luthardt*, explain in this way: "I go not up with the caravan; or, as *Cyril*, *Lange*, etc., "I go not up to celebrate the feast" (οὐχ οὕτως ἐορτάζων); which would not exclude the possibility that Jesus should go to Jerusalem during the feast. In fact, the full celebration of the feast, as the brethren of Jesus conceived of it, included certain indispensable rites, certain sacrifices of purification, which the pilgrims were obliged to offer before its beginning (xi. 55). And if it

is objected that in ver. 10 John must have said, not : "He went up to the feast," but : "He went up to Jerusalem," this objection falls before the Alexandrian reading, which refers the words to the feast, not to : "And Jesus went up," but to the clause : "When His brethren were gone up." This very ingenious interpretation is not wanting in probability ; its only defect is its excess of ingenuity. That which I have given in the first place, and to which the context more directly leads, seems to me preferable. It removes from Jesus, not only the accusation of falsehood, but also that of inconsistency which the philosopher Porphyry in the fourth century brought against Him on this account. The meaning given by Westcott : "I cannot yet go up as Messiah ; but this does not prevent my going up as a prophet," has a certain agreement with our explanation. Only it attributes to Jesus a reticence which is very much like mental reservation.

Vv. 9, 10. "Having said this<sup>1</sup> to them<sup>2</sup> he remained in Galilee. 10. But when his brethren had gone up to the feast,<sup>3</sup> then he also went up himself, not openly, but as it were<sup>4</sup> in secret." The ninth verse signifies that He allowed His brethren to depart, and ver. 10 gives us to understand that, when He went up Himself afterwards, it was either entirely alone or with one or two only of His most intimate associates. Thus are the words : *as it were in secret*, most naturally explained. Ως, which is certainly authentic, softens the expression ἐν κρυπτῷ : Jesus was not really a man who concealed Himself, although He for the moment acted as such. But why go up, if this act might so soon bring the end of His activity? The answer is simple. Jesus was not able, even to the end, to withdraw from the obligation of giving testimony before the assembled people in Jerusalem. But He avoided going thither in company with the numerous caravans which were at that time proceeding on their way towards the capital. A new movement of enthusiasm might manifest itself, like that in ch. vi., and without the possibility on His part of restraining it. The state of men's minds, as it is described in vv. 11-13, proves that the danger was a very real one. It could not be prevented except by a course of action such as He adopts here. Besides, He thereby prevented the hostile measures which might have been taken against Him in advance by the authorities. What a sad gradation or rather degradation, since the first Passover in ch. ii. ! There, He entered the temple as Messiah-King ; in ch. v., He had arrived as a simple pilgrim ; here He can no more even come publicly to Jerusalem in this character : He is reduced to the necessity of going thither *incognito*.

An hypothesis of Wieseler has found favor with some interpreters. According to this scholar, this journey is identical with that which is spoken of in Luke ix. 51 ff. This uniting of the two cannot be sustained. In Luke ix. Jesus gives to His departure from Galilee the character of the

<sup>1</sup> Δε is omitted by Ν D K Π some Mnn. It<sup>1</sup>perique Syr.

<sup>2</sup> Ν D K L X Π some Mnn. It<sup>1</sup>perique Cop. read αὐτοῖς (he) instead of αὐτοῖς (to them).

<sup>3</sup> Ν B K L T X Π place εἰς τὴν εορτὴν (to the feast) before τότε (then).

<sup>4</sup> Ν D It<sup>1</sup>q Syr<sup>eur</sup> omit ὡς before ἐν κρυπτῷ.

greatest publicity: He sends, two and two, His seventy disciples into all the cities and villages through which He is to pass (x. 1); He makes long stays (xiii. 22; xvii. 11); multitudes accompany Him (xiv. 25). And this, it is said, is to go to Jerusalem, *as it were, in secret!* It would be better to give up all harmony between John and the Synoptics, than to obtain it by thus violating the texts. Exegesis simply establishes the fact, as we have said above, that the journey of which John here speaks, as well as those of chaps. ii. and v., is omitted by the Synoptics. And, as *Gess* observes, the omission of the last two journeys (chaps. v. and vii.) is the less surprising, since Jesus seems to have gone to Jerusalem both times alone or almost alone. *Hengstenberg* thinks that this journey (together with the sojourn in Perca x. 40), corresponds to the departure mentioned in Matt. xix. 1; Mark x. 1. But the exegesis of the passage in Matthew by means of which this scholar tries to reach this result, is unnatural. See on ver. 1 and x. 22 for the relation between the journeys of John and those of the Synoptics, Luke ix. 51; Matt. xix. 1; Mark x. 1.

The following verses describe in an animated and dramatic way what occurred at Jerusalem before the arrival of Jesus, as soon as the fact of His absence was discovered.

Vv. 11-13. "*The Jews therefore sought him at the feast, and said, where is he? 12. And there was much murmuring concerning him among the multitudes.<sup>1</sup> Some said, He is a good man. Others said, No, but he leads the multitude astray. However, no one spoke openly of him for fear of the Jews.*" This narrative justifies the circumspect action of Jesus. This popular agitation proves the immense sensation which had been produced by His appearance and the impression which His last sojourn in Jerusalem had left (chap. v.). We find again in this representation, vv. 11-13, the contrast which appears continually in our Gospel between those whom the light attracts and those whom it repels. The term *γογγυσμός*, *murmuring*, denotes the *rumors* in both senses, friendly and hostile. The *ὄχλοι* are the groups of pilgrims. *Ἀγαθός*, *good man*, signifies here an *upright* man, in contrast with an impostor ("He leads the people astray"). *τὸν ὄχλον*, *the multitude* (ver. 12), designates the common people who allowed themselves to be easily deluded by every demagogue. The words: *No one spoke openly*, must not be referred to those only who, though well disposed, did not dare to manifest aloud their sympathy. The rest also, those who said: "He is an impostor," did not speak freely, in the sense that through servility they went in their expressions beyond what they really thought. *Weiss* thinks, on the contrary, that they would have said yet more that was evil of Him, if they had not feared the change on the part of the leaders to a more favorable judgment. This explanation seems to me scarcely natural. However it may be, a pressure coming from above was exerted upon all, upon those who were well-disposed towards Jesus, as upon those who were ill-disposed.

<sup>1</sup> *8* D It. Vulg. Syr. read τῶ ὄχλῳ instead of τοῖς ὄχλοις.

II.—*During the Feast*: vii. 14-36.

The first agitation had subsided; every one was quietly attending to the celebration of the feast, when all at once Jesus appears in the temple and sets Himself to the work of teaching. The authorities had not taken any measures against Him; and there was still time enough remaining for Him before the end of the feast to accomplish His work and to invite to faith the people who had come from all the regions of the world.

This passage includes three teachings of Jesus, interrupted and in part called forth by the remarks of His hearers. The first is an explanation respecting the origin of His *doctrine* and a justification of the miracle which was performed in chap. v. and which was made a means of attack upon His divine mission (vv. 14-24); the second is an energetic declaration of *His divine origin* called forth by an objection (vv. 25-30); the third contains, on occasion of a step taken by the rulers, the announcement of His approaching *end* and calls the attention of the Jews to the consequences which this departure will have for them (vv. 31-36). Following upon each of these discourses, John describes the different impressions which manifested themselves in the multitudes.

The difference of tone in these three testimonies is observable: in the first, defense, in the second, protestation, finally, in the third, warning.

I.—*The Origin of His Teaching and the Refutation of an Accusation*: vv. 14-24.

## 1. Vv. 14-18: His teaching.

Vv. 14, 15. "Nevertheless, when the feast was already half finished, Jesus went up to the temple; and he taught there. 15. And<sup>1</sup> the Jews were astonished, saying, How does this man know the Scriptures, not being a man who has studied?" The question of the Jews bears only upon the competency of Jesus (as *Tholuck* thinks, according to the Rabbinical customs of the later times); their astonishment, according to the text, arose from the boldness and skill with which He handled the Scriptural declarations. It is not necessary to understand an object with *μεμαθηκός*, *having studied*, as our translators do ("not having studied *them*"). [The English translators, both in A. V. and R. V., translate without the objective word.] This word is absolute: not having passed through the school of the masters; "not being a learned man" (*Reuss*). *Γράμματα*, letters, denotes, undoubtedly, literature in general, and not only the sacred Scriptures (*γραφαί, ἱερὰ γράμματα*). Comp. Acts xxvi. 24. But as the sacred writings were among the Jews the essential object of literary studies, *γράμματα* certainly refers first of all to the Scriptures. This saying of the adversaries of Jesus proves, as *Meyer* justly observes, that it was a fact generally known that Jesus had not received any Rabbinical teaching.

<sup>1</sup> ⚪ B D L T X: *εθανμαζον ουν*, instead of *και εθανμαζον*.

V. 16, 17. "*Jesus answered*<sup>1</sup> *them and said, My teaching is not mine, but his that sent me; 17 if any one wills to do his will, he shall know of the teaching whether it comes from God or whether I speak of myself.*" Jesus enters for form's sake into the thought of His hearers: in order to teach, it is surely necessary to have been the disciple of some one. But He shows that He satisfies this demand also: "I have not passed through the teachings of your Rabbis; but I nevertheless come forth from a school, and from a good school. He who gave me my mission, at the same time instructed me as to my message, for I do not derive what I say from my own resources. I limit myself to laying hold of and giving forth with docility His thought."

But how prove this assertion as to the origin of His teaching? Every man, even the most ignorant, is in a condition to do it. For the condition of this proof is a purely moral one. To aspire after doing what is good with earnestness is sufficient. The teaching of Jesus Christ, in its highest import, is in fact only a divine method of sanctification; whoever consequently seeks with earnestness to do the will of God, that is to say, to sanctify himself, will soon prove the efficaciousness of this method, and will infallibly render homage to the divine origin of the Gospel. Several interpreters, especially among the Fathers (*Augustine*) and the reformers (*Luther*), have understood by the *will of God* the commandment as to faith in Jesus Christ: "He who is willing to obey God *by believing in me*, will not be slow in convincing himself by his own experience that he is right in acting thus." The sense given by *Lampe* approaches this; he refers the will of God to the precepts of Christian morality: "He who is willing to practise what I command will soon convince himself of the divine character of what I teach." *Reuss*, in like manner: "Jesus declares (*John vii. 17*) that, in order to comprehend His discourses, one must begin by putting *them* in practice." The earnest practice of the Gospel law must lead in fact to faith in the Christian dogma. But, true as all these ideas may be in themselves, it is evident that Jesus can here use the words *will of God* only in a sense understood and admitted by His hearers, and that this term consequently in this context designates the contents of the divine revelation granted to the Israelites through the law and the prophets. The meaning of this saying amounts, therefore, to that of v. 46: "*If you earnestly believed Moses, you would believe in me,*" or to that of iii. 21: "*He who practices the truth, comes to the light.*" Powerless to realize the ideal which flees before it in proportion as it believes itself to be drawing near to it, the sincere soul feels itself forced to seek rest at first, and then strength, in the presence of the divine Saviour who offers Himself to it in the Gospel. Faith is, therefore, not the result of a logical operation; it is formed in the soul as the conclusion of a moral experience: the man believes because his heart finds in Jesus the only effectual means of satisfying the most legitimate of all its wants, that of holiness. *Θέλη, wills*, indicates simply aspiration, effort; the realization itself

<sup>1</sup> Most of the Mss. add *ὁυυ*.

remains impossible, and this it is precisely which impels the soul to faith.<sup>1</sup> The intrinsic and communicative holiness of the Gospel answers exactly to the need of saretification which impels the soul. See the normal experience of this fact in St. Paul: Rom. vii. 24, and viii. 2. *Suavis harmonia* (between *θέλειν* and *θέλημα*), says *Bengel*. There is a special feature in the teaching of Jesus which will not fail to strike him who is in the way of making the trial indicated in ver. 17. This feature will reveal to him in the most decisive way the divine origin of the teaching of Jesus:

Ver. 18. "*He that speaks from himself, seeks his own glory; but he that seeks the glory of him that sent him, this one is true, and there is no unrighteousness in him.*" The messenger who seeks only the glory of the master who sends him, and does not betray any personal interest in his communications, gives, in this very fact, proof of the fidelity with which he delivers his message; as certainly as he does not say anything with a view to himself, so certainly also he does not say anything as self-moved. The application to Jesus which is to be made of this evident and general truth is left to the mind of the hearers. The teaching of Jesus presents a characteristic which is particularly fitted to strike the man who is eager for holiness: it is that it tends altogether to glorify God, and God alone. From the *aim* one can infer the *origin*; since everything in the Gospel is with a view to God, everything in it must also proceed from God. Here is one of the experiences by means of which the moral syllogism is formed, through which the soul eagerly desirous of good discerns God as

<sup>1</sup> We may be permitted to quote here an incident in the history of missions which seems to us to furnish the most beautiful commentary on this saying of Jesus. It is taken from the account of the residence of MM. Hac and Gabet, Catholic missionaries in China, in 1846, at Lhassa, the capital of Thibet. "A physician, a native of the province of Yunnan, showed more generosity. This young man, after his arrival at Lhassa, led so strange a life that every one called him the *Chinese hermit*. He went out only to visit his patients, and ordinarily went only to the poor. The rich solicited him in vain; he disdained answering their invitations, unless he was forced by necessity to obtain some assistance; for he did not ever receive anything from the poor, to whose service he devoted himself. The time which was not absorbed in visiting the sick, he consecrated to study; he even passed the greater part of the night over his books. He slept little and took by day only one meal of barley meal, without ever using meat. It was only necessary, moreover, to see him in order to be convinced that he led a rude and painful life; his face was extremely pallid and thin, and, although he was at the most only about thirty years of age, his hair was almost entirely white. One day he came to see us while we were reciting the breviary in our

little chapel; he stopped at the distance of a few paces from the door and listened gravely and in silence. A large colored image, representing the crucifixion, had doubtless fixed his attention; for as soon as we had ended our prayers, he asked us abruptly, and without stopping to show us the ordinary marks of politeness, to explain to him what this image signified. When we had satisfied his request, he crossed his arms on his breast, and, without saying a single word, he remained immovable, with his eyes fixed upon the image of the crucifixion; he kept this position during nearly half an hour; his eyes, at length, were moistened with tears; he extended his arms towards the Christ, then he fell on his knees, struck the ground three times with his forehead and rose, crying, 'There is the only Buddha whom men ought to worship!' Afterwards he turned towards us, and, after having made us a profound bow, he added: 'You are my masters, take me for your disciple.' (*Voyage en Tartarie et en Thibet*, t. ii. p. 325-328.) Such is the profound affinity which exists between the soul which is willing to do what is good, as far as it has been revealed to the conscience, and Christ through whom alone it sees itself made capable of realizing it.

the author of the teaching of Christ. There is, at the same time, in this saying, a reply to the accusation of those who said: *He leads the people astray*. He who abuses others, certainly acts thus for himself, not with a view to God. In order thoroughly to understand this reasoning, it is sufficient to apply it to the Bible in general: He who is glorified in this book, from the first page to the last, to the exclusion of every man, is God; man is constantly judged and humbled in it. This book, therefore, is of God. This argument is the one which most directly affects the conscience.

The last words of ver. 18: *And there is no unrighteousness in him*, contain the transition from the teaching of Jesus (His *λαλεῖν*, vv. 17, 18) to His conduct (His *ποιεῖν* vv. 19-23), but this not in a general and commonplace way. If Jesus comes to speak here of His moral conduct, it is because there was thought to be discovered in it a certain subject of reproach which was alleged against the divinity of His teaching and His mission, and with reference to which He had it in mind, by this argument, to justify Himself.

Without the following verses, we might think that these last words: *And there is no unrighteousness in him*, apply only to the accusation stated in ver. 12: He is an impostor. But the argument contained in vv. 19-23 shows clearly, in spite of the denials of *Meyer*, *Weiss* and *Keil*, that Jesus is already thinking especially of the accusation which was still hanging over Him as violating the Sabbath, since His previous visit to Jerusalem (chap. v.). This was the the offense by which the summary judgment: *He deceives the people*, was justified in presence of the multitude. The term *ἀδικία*, *unrighteousness*, therefore, does not here signify, as some think: *falsehood*: but, as ordinarily: *unrighteousness*, moral disorder. Jesus passes to the accusation of which He was the object in chap. v., because He is anxious to take away with reference to this point every pretext for unbelief.

## 2. Vv. 19-24: His moral conduct.

Vv. 19-23. "*Has not Moses given<sup>1</sup> you the law? And yet no one of you keeps the law. Why do you seek to kill me?* 20. *The multitude answered and said: Thou art possessed by a demon; who is seeking to kill thee?* 21. *Jesus answered and said to them: I have done one work, and you are all in astonishment.* 22. *For this reason<sup>2</sup> Moses has given you circumcision (not that it is of Moses, but it comes from the fathers), and on the Sabbath you circumcise a man.* 23. *If a man receives circumcision on the Sabbath, that the law of Moses may not be broken, are you angry with me because I have healed a man altogether on a Sabbath?*" This passage is an example of the skill with which Jesus handled the law. But, to understand this argument, we must guard ourselves against generalizing, as most of the interpreters do, the idea of ver. 19: *No one of you fulfills the law*. Thus some, as *Meyer*, think that Jesus means: "How will you have the right to condemn me, you who yourselves

<sup>1</sup> B D H read *εδωκεν*, in opposition to the 15 other Mj. which have *δεδωκεν*.

<sup>2</sup> X omits *δια τουτο* (on account of this).

sin?" *Weiss*, nearly the same: "You who do not measure your conduct according to the rule of the law, how do you condemn me according to it?" But if Jesus had really violated the law, wherein would their violations justify His? Could He claim that there was no *imposture in Him*? Others (*Hengstenberg*, *Waitz*, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1881, p. 148) seek the explanation of this charge in the following question: *Why do you seek to kill me?* Their murderous hatred—in this is the transgression of the law with which He charges them. But the expression: *not to fulfill*, would be too feeble to designate a desire to murder. And with all this, no explanation is given of the meaning of the first question: *Has not Moses given you the law?* which appears to be absolutely idle. So we can scarcely be surprised that *Berthing* (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1880) has proposed, in spite of the authority of all the documents, to transpose the passage vii. 19-24 and place it before v. 17! All these difficulties vanish as soon as ver. 19 is referred to its true object, which clearly appears from vv. 22, 23. Jesus declares in the first place, in a purely abstract way, the fact at which He is aiming. "You yourselves, with all your respect for Moses your lawgiver, know well that occasionally you place yourselves above his law! And yet you desire to put me to death because I have thought that I could do as you do, and with much more right even than you." These words contain the fundamental thought of the following reasoning. And it is so true that Jesus, in speaking thus, is already thinking of the act of chap. v., that the expression: *wish to kill me*, reproduces the very terms of v. 16. This question is addressed to the multitude who surround Jesus only so far as He regards it as representing the entire nation with its spiritual directors.

Vv. 20, 21. Jesus was going to explain Himself, when the portion of this multitude which was not acquainted with the designs of the rulers, interrupts Him and charges Him with giving Himself up to gloomy ideas and suspicions without foundation. Despondency, melancholy, sombre thoughts were attributed to a diabolical possession (the *κακοδαίμονῶν* of the Greeks). Jesus, without noticing this supposition, which must fall of itself, simply takes up again and continues His argument which had been already begun. He acknowledges having done *one work*, not a miracle in general, but an act in which one can see a work contrary to the Sabbath ordinance: "And thereupon," He adds, "behold you are all crying out with offense and wishing for my death because of this work!" The word *ἑνὸς ἔργου* expresses here the horror which one feels at a monstrous act. *Ἐν ἑνὸς ἔργου*, *one single work*, in contrast to all theirs of the same kind, which they, every one of them, do in the case which He is about to cite to them.

The first words of ver. 22: *Moses has given you circumcision*, reproduce the analogous words of ver. 19: *Has not Moses given you the law?* and complete them. The point in hand is to render this fact palpable to them: that *Moses* indeed, their own lawgiver, places himself on His side in the act which He is about to call to their minds. Indeed, this *Moses* who gave them the law of Sinai and established the Sabbath (ver. 19), is he who also prescribed to them circumcision (ver. 22). Now, by giving you this second ordinance, he has himself made all the Israelitish fathers of fami-

lies transgressors of the first. For, as each one of them is bound to circumcise his child on the eighth day, it follows that every time that the eighth day falls upon a Sabbath, they themselves sacrifice the Sabbatic rest to the ordinance of circumcision. In the single word of Moses relative to circumcision (Lev. xii. 3), the inevitable collision of this rite with the Sabbatic ordinance was neither provided for nor regulated. It was the Israelite conscience which had spontaneously resolved the collision in favor of circumcision, rightly placing the well-being of the man above the Sabbatic obligation. In our first edition, we referred the *διὰ τοῦτο*, for this cause, with most modern interpreters (*Weiss, Keil, etc.; Waitz* does not decide), to the verb: *you are in astonishment*, of ver. 21. This reference is justified by the difficulty of making the *for this* bear upon the following idea: *Moses has given*. How, indeed, can we make Jesus say that Moses has given to the Jews the command to circumcise with a view to the conflict which would result from it with the Sabbatic command? We do not discuss the opinion of *Meyer* and *Luthardt*, who make the *διὰ τοῦτο*, for this cause, of ver. 22, refer to the clause *ὄχι ὅτι*, not that . . . , an interpretation which evidently does violence to the text. But is it not possible to justify the grammatical reference of the words: *for this*, to the totality of ver. 22? The following, in that case, is the sense: "It is precisely *for this*, that is to say, with the design of teaching you not to judge as you are doing—when you are scandalized (*ἀναμάζετε*) at my Sabbath work—that Moses did not hesitate to impose the rite of circumcision upon you, while introducing into his law this conflict with the law of the Sabbath. Thereby, he has justified me in advance, by making all of you commit the transgression for which you are seeking to kill me." Thus understood, this *for this cause* contains the most piquant irony: "Moses has in advance pleaded my cause before you, by making you all jointly responsible for the crime with which you charge me, and by himself proving to you in this way that, when the good of man demands it, the rest of the Sabbath must be subordinated to a higher interest." If we accept this sense, we must make the *for this cause* refer also to the last clause of ver. 22: "*For this cause* indeed has Moses given you . . . and consequently you perform the rite of circumcision even on the Sabbath."

It is not easy to understand the purpose of the limitation: *Not that circumcision is of Moses, but of the fathers*. If it were intended, as a large number of interpreters will have it, to exalt the rite of circumcision by recalling to mind its high antiquity, it would weaken rather than strengthen the argument; for the more venerable the rite of circumcision is, the more natural is it that it should take precedence of the Sabbath, a point which diminishes the force of the argument. Besides, might it not have been answered: The Sabbath also is anterior to Moses, it is anterior even to Abraham, for it dates from the creation? *Hengstenberg* and many others think that, in inserting this remark, Jesus means to defend His Scriptural erudition, which was praised in ver. 15, from the charge of inaccuracy which the preceding declaration might bring upon Him. This explanation is puerile; if it were well founded, nothing would remain,

as *Lücke* says, but to impute this parenthesis to the narrator. The true explanation is, perhaps, the following: "Although circumcision does not form a part of the totality of the Mosaic code, given by means of the angels and placed in the hands of the mediator (Gal. iii. 19; Heb. ii. 2), and although it was only the result of a patriarchal tradition, nevertheless Moses did not hesitate to assign to it, in the Israelitish life, a dignity before which he made the Sabbath itself give way, an evident proof that everything which is of importance to the salvation of man takes precedence of the Sabbath." This remark would serve to confirm the entire argument of the Lord. Or it might be necessary to explain the matter in this way: In general, the more recent regulation abolishes *ipso facto* the earlier one. It would seem, then, that the ordinance of circumcision must yield precedence to that of the Sabbath, which was more positive and *more recent*. And yet here there is nothing of the kind; it is the Sabbath that must give way. This circumstance would also rise in evidence against the absolute, exaggerated importance which was attributed by the Jews to the Sabbath rest. *Renan* cites this passage as one of those which "bear the marks of erasures or corrections" (p. xxxii.). When properly understood, the passage becomes, on the contrary, from one end to the other, an example of the most concise logical argumentation.

The words of ver. 23: *that the law of Moses may not be broken*, have a special force: the Jews transgress the Sabbath (by circumcising on that day) precisely to the end that they may not disobey Moses!—In order thoroughly to understand the *a fortiori* of ver. 23, we must remember that there are in these two facts which are placed in a parallelism, circumcision and the cure wrought by Jesus, at once a physical and a moral side. In circumcision, the physical side consists in a local purification; and the moral side in the incorporation into the typical covenant of the circumcised child. In the miracle of Jesus, the physical fact was a complete restoration of the health of the impotent man, and the moral end, his salvation (v. 14 "*Thou hast been healed, sin no more*"). In these two respects, the superiority of the second of these acts to the first was beyond question; and consequently the infraction of the Sabbath was justified, in the point of view of its utility for the human being, in the second case still more than in the first. We must avoid the explanation of *Bengel* and *Sier*, who think that by the expression: *a whole man*, Jesus here means to designate the physical *and moral* man, in contrast to the purely physical man, the end in view in circumcision. Circumcision was not, in the eyes of the Jews, a merely medical affair.

What is remarkable in this defense is, in the first place, the fact that Jesus does not set forth the *miraculous* nature of the act which was made the subject of accusation; *one work*, He modestly says: it is nevertheless clear that the marvelous character of this work forms the imposing rear guard of the argument. In the next place, there is the difference between this mode of justification and that of chap. v.: Jesus here speaks to the multitudes; His demonstration is not dogmatic; He borrows it from a fact of practical life, of which every Jew was constantly a witness,

if even he was not a participator in it: "What I have done, you all do, and for much less!" What could be more popular and more striking? We find again, at the foundation of this argument, the axiom which is formulated by Jesus in the Synoptics: "Man is not made for the Sabbath, but the Sabbath is made for man" (Mark ii. 27).

Ver. 24. "*Judge not according to the appearance; but pronounce the judgment*<sup>1</sup> *which is in accordance with righteousness.*" ὄψις, *sight*, hence *appearance*, designates here the external and purely formal side of things. It was only from this defective point of view that the healing of the impotent man could be made the subject of accusation. There is no question here of the humble appearance of Jesus which had perverted the judgment of the Jews (Wätz). *Righteous judgment* is that which estimates the acts according to the *spirit* of the law. The article before the word κρίσιν, *judgment*, may denote either *the judgment* in this definite case, or, in general, *the judgment* in each case where there is occasion to pass judgment. In the first clause, which is negative, the present κρίνετε is very appropriate: for the question is of the judgment pronounced in this case on the act of Jesus. But in the second, the present is probably a correction in accordance with the first. The aorist, κρίνατε, is perfectly suitable: Judge righteously in every case (without reference to time).

## 2. The True Origin of Jesus: vv. 25-30.

Vv. 25-27. "*Some of the inhabitants of Jerusalem said therefore, Is not this man here the one whom they seek to kill? 26. And behold, he speaks openly, and they say nothing to him. Can*<sup>2</sup> *the rulers*<sup>3</sup> *indeed*<sup>4</sup> *have recognized the fact that he is the Christ? 27. But as for this man, we know whence he is, while as for the Christ, when he shall come,*<sup>5</sup> *no one will know whence he is.*" So great freedom and eclat in the preaching of Jesus struck some of the dwellers in Jerusalem with surprise (οὖν, *therefore*). Knowing the intentions of the priestly authorities better than the multitude who had come from outside (ὁ ὄχλος, of ver. 20), they were on the point of drawing from this fact conclusions favorable to Jesus; but they feel themselves arrested by an opinion which was generally spread abroad at that time, and which seemed to them irreconcilable with the supposition of His Messianic dignity: that the origin of the Messiah was to be entirely unknown. We find an opinion which is nearly related to this expressed by *Justin*. About the middle of the second century, this Father puts into the mouth of the Jew Trypho these words: "The Christ, even after His birth, is to remain unknown and not to know Himself and to be without power, until Elijah comes and anoints Him and reveals Him to all." "Three things," say the Rabbis, "come unexpectedly: the Messiah, the God-send and the

<sup>1</sup> B D L T read κρίνετε; T. R. with all the rest, κρίνατε.

<sup>2</sup> N D: μητι instead of μηποτε.

<sup>3</sup> N αρχιερεις (*chief priests*) instead of αρχον-

τες.

<sup>4</sup> B D K L T X Π 25 Mm. Italicque Vulg. Cop. Syroeur Orig. omit αληθως (*truly*), which T. R. reads with 11 Mj.

<sup>5</sup> N adds μη πλειονα σημεια ποιησει η before οταν ερχηται.

scorpion" (*Sanhedr.* 97a, see *Westcott*). This idea probably arose from the prophecies which announced the profound humiliation to which the family of David would be reduced at the time of the advent of the Christ (*Is.* xi. 1; liii. 2). It was true that it was not unknown, that the Messiah would be born at Bethlehem; but the words: *whence He is*, refer not to the locality, but to the parents and family of the Messiah. Those who speak thus imagine of course that they are acquainted with the origin of Jesus, in this second relation also. *Comp.* vi. 42. Thus they sacrifice the moral impression produced upon them by the person and word of the Lord to a mere critical objection: a bad method of reaching the truth!

Vv. 28, 29. "Jesus cried therefore, teaching in the temple and saying: You both know me and you know whence I am: and yet I am not come of myself; but he who sent me is competent,<sup>1</sup> whom you know not. 29. As for me,<sup>2</sup> I know him; for I come from him<sup>3</sup> and he sent me." Jesus taking this objection as a starting-point (*therefore*), pronounces a new discourse which relates, no longer to the origin of His doctrine, but to that of His *mission* and of His *person* itself. The term *ἐκραζεν*, *he cried*, expresses a high elevation of the voice, which is in harmony with the solemnity of the following declaration. The words: *in the temple*, call to mind the fact that it was under the eyes and even in the hearing of the rulers that Jesus spoke in this way (*comp.* ver. 32). Jesus enters here, as in ver. 16, into the thought of His adversaries; He accepts the objection in order to turn it into a proof in His favor. In the first place, He repeats their assertion. The repetition of their own words, as well as the two *καί* which introduce the first two clauses, give to this affirmation an interrogative and slightly ironical turn: "You both know me, and you know . . .?" This form of expression reveals an intention of setting forth a false claim on their part, for the purpose of afterwards confuting it. The third *καί*, *and*, forms an antithesis to the first two and begins the reply of Jesus. This is, with shades of difference, the sense given by most of the interpreters. *Meyer* and *Weiss* think that it is better to see in the first two clauses a concession: "Yes, no doubt you do know my person and my origin up to a certain point; but this is only one side of the truth; there is a higher side of it which you do not know and which is this." But it would have been difficult for His hearers to get this idea: "You know me; but you do not know me." Jesus rejects the very premises of their argument; and to the fact alleged by them He opposes a directly contrary one: "You think you know me, but you do not know me, either as to my mission or as to my origin (ver. 29)." And as they seem to suppose that He has given Himself His commission, He adds: "I have one sending me, and this one is the veritable sender, that is to say, He who alone has the power to give 'divine' missions." The adjective *ἀληθινός* has not here, any more than elsewhere, the sense of *ἀληθής*, *true*, as a large number of interpreters from *Chrysostom* to *Bäumlein* have thought. Jesus does not mean to say that the Being who

<sup>1</sup> N: ἀληθης, instead of ἀληθινος.

Cop. Syr.

<sup>2</sup> T. R. adds δε with N D X some Mnn. Italic

<sup>3</sup> N: παρ' αυτου, instead of παρ' αυτον.

sends Him is morally true; no more does He mean that He is *real* (see my 2d ed.), that is, that He is not imaginary, and consequently that His mission is not fictitious and a matter purely of the imagination; this is not what ἀληθινός signifies. But the sense is: "The one sending me is the true sender." The last words: *whom you know not*, are very severe. How can Jesus charge Jews with not knowing Him of whom they make it their boast to be the only worshipers? But this strange ignorance is nevertheless the true reason why they cannot discern the divine origin of His mission. At the same time He shows them thereby, with much acuteness, that the very criterion by which they intend to deny Him, as Messiah, is precisely that which marks Him as such. In fact the postulate which is laid down by the Jews themselves, in ver. 27, is found thereby to be only too fully realized! It is an argument *ad hominem*, which Jesus allows Himself because He finds thus the means of presenting to this company of people the notion of the Messiah in its most exalted light, as He does in the following verses.

Ver. 29. To the ignorance of God with which He charges the Jews, Jesus opposes the intimate consciousness which He Himself has of God and of His true relation to Him. This relation is, first of all, a relation of essence (*εἰμί, I am, I proceed from Him*). In fact, this first clause cannot refer to the *mission* of Jesus which is expressly mentioned in the following one. Jesus affirms that He knows God, first by virtue of a *community of essence* which unites Him to Him. The second clause does not depend on the word *because*. It is an affirmation, which serves also to justify His claim to know God. The one sent has intimate communion with Him who sends Him, and consequently must know Him. Hence it follows that Jesus is the Messiah, and that in a sense much more exalted than that which the Jews attributed to this office.

Ver. 30. "*They sought therefore to take him; and yet no one laid hands on him, because his hour was not yet come.*" The result of this strong protestation (*therefore*) was to confirm His declared enemies in the design of arresting Him. It is clear that the ζῆτεῖν (*to seek*) was an affair of the rulers, as in v. 16, 18. They were strengthened in their resolution of accomplishing it and in the search for the means of arriving at the result. But the appointed hour had not yet struck. The expression: *his hour*, does not designate that of His arrest (xviii. 12), as *Hengstenberg* thinks, but that of His death as the result of His arrest (comp. vii. 8). The divine decree, to which the evangelist alludes thereby, does not exclude second causes; on the contrary, it implies them. Among these, the interpreters make especially prominent the veneration with which the multitudes at this time regarded Jesus. Yes, assuredly; comp. Luke xx. 19. But we may also think, with *Hengstenberg*, of the resistance which the conscience of His enemies was still opposing to the extreme measures to which their hatred was impelling them. When the hardening of their hearts was consummated and the Spirit of God ceased to restrain their hands, then the hour of Jesus struck. There is, therefore, no reason to assert, with *Reuss*, that "the historical interpretation of this verse creates a contra-

diction." The sequel is about to show us a first attempt in the sense indicated, but one which fails precisely because the moral ground was not yet sufficiently prepared. This verse is thus the transition to the following narrative, which relates the first judicial measure taken against Jesus.

### 3. *The Approaching Departure of Jesus*: vv. 31-36.

Vv. 31, 32. "*But of the multitude<sup>1</sup> many believed on him; and they said, When the Christ shall come, will he do more miracles<sup>2</sup> than those which this man has done?*"<sup>3</sup> 32. *The Pharisees heard<sup>4</sup> this talk which was circulating among the multitude concerning him, and the chief priests and the Pharisees<sup>5</sup> sent officers to take him.*" While the adversaries of Jesus were becoming fixed in their hostile designs, a great part of the multitude were strengthened in faith. Ver. 31 marks a decided advance on ver. 12. The partisans of Jesus are more numerous, and their profession of faith is more explicit, notwithstanding the position of dependence in which they still were in relation to the rulers. If timidity had not arrested them, they would have gone forward to the point of proclaiming Jesus the Messiah. The reading *ἔποίησεν, has done*, is wrongly replaced in the Sinaitic MS. by *ποιεῖ, he does*. The question is of His earlier miracles in Galilee and in Judea itself: ii. 23; chap. v.; vi. 2.

This impression made on the multitude exasperates the rulers, especially those of the Pharisaic party. The place of the meetings of the Sanhedrim could not have been far from that where these scenes were passing (see on viii. 20). It is therefore possible that, in going thither, some of the rulers may have heard with their own ears this talk favorable to Jesus; or also spies may have brought it to them during their meeting; the term *heard* allows both meanings. This is the moment when the Sanhedrim suffers itself to be impelled to a step which may be regarded as the beginning of the judicial measures of which the crucifixion of Jesus was the end. It was certainly under the influence of the Pharisaic party, whose name appears twice in this verse. The second time, however, their name is preceded, according to the true reading, by that of the *chief priests*; the latter are mentioned separately, because they belonged at this epoch rather to the Sadducee party, and they are placed first because, if the impulse had been given by the Pharisees, the measures in the way of execution must have started from the chief priests, who, as members of the priestly families, formed the ruling part of the Sanhedrim. The officers who were sent undoubtedly did not have orders to seize Him immediately; otherwise they could not have failed to execute this commission. They were to mingle in the crowds and, taking advantage of a favorable moment when Jesus should give them some

<sup>1</sup> B K L T X Π place the words *ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου* δε at the beginning of the verse; T. R. with 10 Mj. places them after *πολλοὶ δε*, N D after *ἐπιστευσαν*.

<sup>2</sup> 8 Mj. (N B D etc.), omit *τῶν* after *σημεῖα*.

<sup>3</sup> N D Itlerique Vulg. Συζητῶν ποιεῖ (*docs*) instead of *ἐποίησεν* (*did*).

<sup>4</sup> K M U Π add *οὐν*, N D δε, after *ἤκουσαν*.

<sup>5</sup> T. R. with 8 Mj. (E H M S etc.) places *οἱ φαρισαῖοι* before *οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς*; N B D etc. place *οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς* first.

handle against Him, and when the wind of popular opinion should happen to turn, to get possession of Him and bring Him before the Sanhedrim. There are in this story shadings and an exactness of details which show an eye-witness.

Vv. 33, 34. "Jesus said<sup>1</sup> therefore: I am with you yet a little while, and then I go to him that sent me. 34. You shall seek me and shall not find me;<sup>2</sup> and where I am you cannot come." Jesus was not ignorant of this hostile measure; and this is what awakened in Him the presentiment of His approaching death which is so solemnly expressed in the following words (*therefore*). In this discourse, He invites the Jews to take advantage of the time, soon to pass away, during which He is still to continue with them. There is a correspondence between the expressions: *I go away*, and: *He who sent me*. The idea of a *sojourn* involves that of a merely *temporary* sojourn here below. The practical conclusion of ver. 33, which is understood, "Hasten to believe!" is made more pressing by ver. 34. Of the two clauses of this verse, the first refers to their national future; the second, to their individual fate. In the first, Jesus describes, in a striking way, the state of abandonment in which this people will soon find itself, provided it persists in rejecting Him who alone can lead it to the Father; a continual and ever disappointed expectation; the impotent attempt to find God, after having suffered the visitation of Him to pass by who alone could have united them to God. This sense is that in which Jesus cites this word in xiii. 33 (comp. xiv. 6). It is also that in which He will repeat it, soon afterwards, in a more emphatic form, viii. 21, 22. There cannot be any difficulty in applying the notion of the pronoun *με*, *me*, to the idea of the Messiah in general. To expect the Messiah is, indeed, on the part of the Jewish people, and without their being aware of it, to seek Jesus, the only Messiah who can be given to them. But there is something more terrible than this future of the nation—it is that of individuals. The expression: *where I am*, denotes symbolically the communion with the Father and the state of salvation which one enjoys in that communion. This is the blessed goal which they cannot reach after having rejected Him; for it is He alone who could have led them thither (xiv. 3). If then they allow this time to pass by, in which they can yet attach themselves to Him, all will be over for them. The present: *where I am*, signifies: "where I shall be at that moment;" it can only be rendered in French by the future. This second part of the verse does not allow us to explain the term: *you shall seek me*, in the first part, either of a seeking inspired by hatred (*Origen*)—comp. xiii. 33—or of a sigh of repentance; such a feeling would not have failed to lead them to salvation.

Vv. 35, 36. "Then the Jews said among themselves, Whither will he go then, that we<sup>3</sup> shall not find him? Does he mean to go to those who are scattered among the Greeks and to teach the Greeks? 36. What means this word which he

<sup>1</sup> The *αυτοῖς* (to them) of the T. R. has in its favor only T and some Mnn.

<sup>2</sup> B T X read *με* after *εὐησῆτε*; the fifteen

other Mj. omit this pronoun.

<sup>3</sup> S D omit *ημεῖς* which all the other Mj. read.

has said: *You shall seek me and shall not find me;<sup>1</sup> and where I am you cannot come.*"<sup>2</sup> These words are, of course, ironical. Rejected by the only Jews who are truly worthy of the name, those who live in the Holy Land and speak the language of the fathers, will Jesus go and try to play His part as Christ among the Jews who are dispersed in the Greek world, and, through their agency, exercise His function as Messiah among the heathen? A fine Messiah, indeed, He who, rejected by the Jews, should become the teacher of the Gentiles! The expression *διασπορά τῶν Ἑλλήνων*, literally: *dispersion of the Greeks*, designates that portion of the Jewish people who lived outside of Palestine, dispersed through Greek countries. *Τοῖς Ἑλλήνας*, *the Greeks*, refers to the Gentiles properly so called. The dispersed Jews will be for this Messiah the means of passing from the Jews to the Gentile peoples! They themselves, however, do not seriously regard this supposition as well founded; and they mechanically repeat the word of Jesus, as if not discovering any meaning in it. Meyer has asserted that this course of action would be impossible, if in ver. 33 Jesus really expressed Himself as the evangelist makes Him speak: "*I go to Him who sent me.*" These last words would have explained everything. They would have understood that a return to God was the thing in question. According to Reuss also, ver. 35 contains a too flagrant misapprehension to be conceivable. But either these words: *to Him who sent me* had left in their minds only a vague idea, or more probably, regarding Jesus as an impostor, they see in them only a vain boast designed to cover a plan of exile, as at viii. 22, a plan of suicide. We cannot form a sufficiently accurate idea of the gross materialism of the contemporaries of Jesus, so as to fix the limits of possibility in their misapprehensions. After having passed years with Jesus, the apostles still interpreted a bidding to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees as a reproof for having neglected to provide themselves with bread—it is they themselves who relate this misunderstanding in the Synoptical Gospels; how then should the Jews, to whom the idea of the departure of the Messiah was as strange as would be to us, at the present hour, that of His visible reign (comp. xii. 34), have immediately understood that, in the preceding words, Jesus was speaking to them of entering into the perfect communion with His Father?

The evangelist takes a kind of pleasure in reproducing *in extenso* this derisive supposition. Why? Because, like the saying of Caiaphas in chap. xii., it seemed at the time and in the regions in which John was writing and in which it was read, like an involuntary prophecy. Indeed, had not Jesus really become the Messiah of the Greeks? Was not John composing this Gospel in the country, and even in the language, of the Gentiles at the same time that the prophecy of Jesus contained in the preceding verses, and turned into ridicule by the Jews, was finding its accomplishment with respect to them in a striking and awful manner before the eyes of the whole world?

<sup>1</sup> B G T X read *με* after *ενηρησε*.

with the words *και επορευθη εκαστος* and the story of the woman taken in adultery.

<sup>2</sup> After this word *ελθειν*, Cod. 225 continues

III.—*On and after the great day of the Feast*: vii. 37–viii. 59.

The last and great day of the feast has arrived; Jesus lays aside the apologetic form which until now He has given to His teachings. His word assumes a solemnity proportioned to that of this holy day; He declares Himself to be the reality of all the great historic symbols which the feast recalls to mind. Such declarations only aggravate the unbelief of a part of those who surround Him, while they draw more closely the bond already formed between the believers and Himself.

Four Divisions: 1. The true source: vii. 37–52; 2. The true light: viii. 12–20; 3. The true Messiah: viii. 21–29; 4. The incurable nature of Jewish unbelief: viii. 30–59. The passage vii. 53–viii. 11, which contains the story of the woman taken in adultery, does not appear to us to belong to the genuine text of the Gospel.

1. *The True Source*: vii. 37–52.

John reports the discourse of Jesus and gives the explanation of it (vv. 37–39); he describes the different impressions of the multitude (vv. 40–44); he gives an account of the meeting of the Sanhedrim, after the return of the officers (vv. 45–52).

Vv. 37–39. The discourse of Jesus.

Vv. 37, 38. “*On the last and great day of the feast, Jesus stood, and, speaking with a loud voice,<sup>1</sup> said: If any thirsts, let him come to me<sup>2</sup> and drink; 38. he that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.*” Almost all the interpreters at the present day acknowledge that the last day of the feast is not the seventh, which was distinguished in no respect from the others, but the eighth, which was marked by certain special ceremonies. No doubt, only seven feast days are mentioned in Deut. xvi. 13. The same is the case in Num. xxix. 12; but in this passage there is found, in ver. 35, this supplementary indication: “*And on the eighth day ye shall have a solemn assembly, and ye shall do no work;*” which agrees with Lev. xxiii. 36, and Neh. viii. 18: “*So they celebrated the solemn feast seven days, and on the eighth day was a solemn assembly, as it was ordained,*” as well as with Josephus (*Antiq.* iii. 10, 4, “*Celebrating the feast during eight days*”), 2 Macc. x. 7 and the statements of the Rabbis. The two modes of counting are easily explained: the life in tents continued seven days, and on the eighth day the people returned to their dwellings. Probably, in this return there was seen, according to the ingenious supposition of Lange, the symbol of the entrance and establishment of the people in the land of Canaan. Philo sees in this eighth day the solemn close of all the feasts of the year. Josephus also calls it: “the sacred closing of the year” (*συνπέρασμα τοῦ ἔτους ἀγιώτερον*). This day was sanctified by a solemn assembly and the Sabbath rest; the whole

<sup>1</sup> N D It. Vulg. Cop.: *κραζεν* (he was crying), all the rest.  
instead of *κραζειν* (he cried) which is read by

<sup>2</sup> N D It<sup>sup</sup> omit *προς με* (to me).

people, abandoning their tents-of leafy branches, went in a procession to the temple, and from thence every one returned to his house. The treatise *Succa* calls this day "the last and good day." The *δέ* indicates an advance: the narrative passes to something greater. The terms *εἰσῆκε* (pluperfect, in the sense of the imperfect) and *ἔκραξε*, *cried*, designate a more solemn attitude and a more elevated tone of voice than ordinary. For the most part, Jesus taught sitting; this time, apparently, He stood up. He was about to apply to Himself one of the most striking Messianic symbols among all those which the national history contained. It is difficult to hold, with *Reuss*, that the figure of which He makes use at this solemn moment was not suggested to Him by some circumstance connected with the feast. Thus almost all the commentators think that He alludes to the libation which was made every morning during the sacred week. Led by a priest, the whole people, after the sacrifice, went down from the temple to the fountain of Siloam; the priest filled at this fountain, already celebrated by the prophets, a golden pitcher, and carried it through the streets amid joyful shouts of the multitude, and with the sound of cymbals and trumpets. The rejoicing was so great that the Rabbis were accustomed to say that he who had not been present at this ceremony and the other similar ones which distinguished this feast, did not know what joy is. On the return to the temple, the priest went up to the altar of burnt-offering; the people cried out to him: "Lift up thy hand!" and he made the libation, turning the golden pitcher to the West, and to the East a cup filled with wine from two silver vases pierced with holes. During the libation, the people sang, always to the sound of cymbals and trumpets, the words of Is. xii. 3: "*Ye shall draw water with joy out of the well of salvation,*" words to which the Rabbinical tradition quite specially attributed a Messianic significance. It may seem probable, therefore, that Jesus alludes to this rite. No doubt, objection is made that according to Rabbi Judah, this libation was not made on the eighth day. But even if it were so, *Lange* judiciously observes that it was precisely the void occasioned by the omission of this ceremony on this day that must have called forth this testimony which was designed to fill it. This method of acting was much better than that of creating a sort of competition with the sacred rite, at the very moment when it was being performed as on the preceding days in the midst of tumultuous joy. Nevertheless we have a more serious reason to allege against this reference of the word of Jesus to the ritual libation. Would it be worthy of Jesus to take for His starting-point in a testimony so important as that which He is about to give, a ceremony which is altogether human? What was this rite? An emblem contrived by the priests for recalling to mind one of the great theocratic miracles wrought in the desert, the pouring forth of the water from the rock. Now, why should not Jesus, instead of thinking of the humanly instituted emblem, have gone back even to the divine blessing itself, which this rite served to recall? The word which He utters stands in a much more direct relation to the miracle than to the ceremony. In the latter it was not the question of drinking, but only

of drawing and pouring out the water, while, in the miracle in the wilderness, the people quenched their thirst from the stream of water coming forth from the rock. It is, then, not to this golden pitcher carried in the procession, but to the rock itself from which God had caused the living water to flow, that Jesus compares Himself. In chap. ii. He had presented Himself as the true temple, in chap. iii., as the true brazen serpent, in chap. vi., as the bread from heaven, the true manna; in chap. vii., He is the true rock; in chap. viii., He will be the true luminous cloud, and soon, until chap. xix. where He will finally realize the type of the Paschal lamb. Thus Jesus takes advantage of the particular circumstances of each feast, to show the Old Covenant realized in His person, so fully does He feel and know Himself as the essence of all the theocratic symbols. In view of all this we may estimate aright the opinion of those who make the fourth Gospel a writing foreign or even opposed to the Old Covenant (*Reuss, Hilgenfeld, etc.*)!

The solemn testimony of vv. 37, 38 therefore places us again face to face with the scene in the wilderness, which had been so vividly recalled, during the course of the feast, by the joyous ceremony of the libation. The first words: "*If any man thirsts,*" bring before our eyes the whole people consumed by thirst in the wilderness. To all those who resemble these thirsting Israelites, the invitation, which is about to follow, addresses itself. Thirst is the emblem of spiritual needs. Comp. Matt. v. 6: "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness." These are the hearts which the Father has *taught* and *drawn* by means of a docile listening to Moses. The expression *ἐὰν τις, if it happens that any one*, reminds us how sporadic these cases are; for the spiritual wants can be easily stifled. For every thirsty heart, Jesus will be what the rock from which the living water sprang forth was for the Israelites: "*Let him come unto me and drink.*" These two imperatives, thus united, signify: There is nothing else to do but to come; when once he has come, let him drink, as formerly the people did. *Reuss, Weiss* and *Keil* object to this interpretation of ver. 37, that in ver. 38 it is the believer who is represented as the refreshing stream. But ver. 38 can in no case serve to explain the idea of ver. 37. For there is between the two, not a relation of explanatory repetition, but a relation of distinctly marked advance. The believer, after having his own thirst quenched (ver. 37), becomes himself capable of quenching the thirst of other souls (ver. 38); this is the striking proof of the fullness with which his own spiritual wants have been satisfied. Now, if the idea changes from ver. 37 to ver. 38, the figure may also change. In ver. 37, the believer drinks of the water of the Rock; in ver. 38, he becomes himself a rock for others. How magnificently is the promise of ver. 37: *Let him drink*, confirmed by this experience! He will be so filled, that he will himself overflow in streams of living water. One of the greatest difficulties of this passage has always been to know what expression of the Old Testament Jesus alludes to, when He says in ver. 38: *as the Scripture has said*; for nowhere does the Old Testament promise to believers the privilege of becoming themselves fountains of living water. *Meyer, Weiss, Keil,*

Reuss, etc., cite passages such as Is. xli. 3: "I will pour water upon him that is thirsty . . . and my Spirit upon his seed"; lv. 1: "All ye who are thirsty, come to the waters;" lviii. 11: "Thou shalt be like a watered garden and as a fountain whose waters fail not." Comp. also Joel iii. 18; Zech. xiv. 8; Ezek. xlvii. 1 ff. etc. But, 1. In none of these passages is the idea expressed which forms the special feature of the promise of Jesus in ver. 38—that of the power communicated to the believer of quenching the thirst of other souls. 2. Nothing in these passages can serve to explain the strange expression *κοιλία*, his heart (literally, his belly). Hengstenberg, always preoccupied with the desire to discover the Song of songs in the New Testament, cites Cant. iv. 12: "My sister, my spouse, thou art a barred garden, a spring shut up, a fountain sealed," and ver. 15: "Oh fountain of gardens, oh well of living waters, flowing streams from Lebanon!" And as these citations strike against the same objection as the preceding, he tries to explain the figure of *κοιλία* by an allusion to Cant. vii. 2, where the navel of Sulamith is compared to a round goblet. What puerilities! According to Beugel, Jesus was thinking of the golden pitcher which served for the libation during the feast; according to Gieseler, of the subterranean cavern situated in the hill of the temple, from which escaped the waters which came forth by the fountain of Siloam. But these two explanations of the term *κοιλία* give no account of the formula of citation which refers us to the Old Testament itself (*ἡ γραφή*, the Scripture). By a desperate expedient, Stier and Gess desire to connect the words: *he that believeth on me*, with ver. 37, and to make them the subject of the imperative *πίτω*: "Let him that believeth on me drink." One comes thus to the point of referring the pronoun *αὐτοῦ*, "of his heart," no longer to the believer, but to Christ. But where has the Scripture ever spoken of the *κοιλία* of the Messiah? And the construction is evidently forced. The pronoun *αὐτοῦ* cannot refer to the object *ἐμέ* me, but only to the subject of the sentence: "*he that cometh.*"<sup>1</sup> Chrysostom makes the Scriptural quotation bear upon the notion of believing: "He who believes on me conformably to the Scriptures." But nothing in the idea of faith calls for a special appeal here to the Old Testament. Senler, Bleek, Weizsäcker think they see in this passage an allusion to an unknown apocryphal writing; Ewald to a lost passage of Proverbs. These would be singular exceptions in the teaching of Jesus. The true explanation seems to me to come from the event itself, of which we believe that Jesus was thinking in ver. 37. It is said in Exod. xvii. 6: "Behold, I will stand before thee there upon the rock in Horeb, and thou shalt smite the rock, and there shall come from within it (*ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας*) waters and the people shall drink;" and Num. xx. 11: "And abundant

<sup>1</sup> In his recent work, *Das Alte Testament bei Johannes* (1885), A. H. Franke favors the grammatical construction which I have just refuted, and starting from the application which Jesus makes, ii. 19-21, of the idea of the temple to His own body, he thinks that the Lord, in virtue of this typical relation, applies here to Himself the different pas-

sages of the prophets in which they promise that a stream shall come forth from the temple in the last times (Joel iv. 18; Zech. xiv. 8, and particularly Ezek. xlvii. 1, 2, etc.). Certainly, if this construction were adopted, this explanation of *κοιλία αὐτοῦ* (his belly) would be preferable to every other.

*waters came forth,"* comp. also Deut. viii. 15; Ps. cxiv. 8. It seems to me probable that these passages had been read on the occasion of the feast, and, that, being present to all minds, they furnished the occasion for this citation: *as the Scripture hath said.* The expression of Jesus *ποταμοὶ ὕδατος, rivers of water,* reproduces that in the Mosaic narrative *מים רבים* (*abundant waters*). The expression *κοιλία αὐτοῦ, his belly,* is derived from the word *minnennou, from within him.* This figure, borrowed from the interior cavity of the rock, from which the waters must have sprung forth, is applied first to Christ Himself, then to the man whose thirst Christ has quenched, and whom He fills with His presence and grace. The future *πέσουσιν, shall flow,* recalls the similar form of the Old Testament: "*waters shall come forth.*" The word *ὁ πιστεύων, he that believeth,* is a nominative placed at the beginning as a nominative absolute, and one which finds its grammatical construction in the *αὐτοῦ* which follows: comp. vi. 39; xvii. 2, etc. If the change of idea and of figure from ver. 37 to ver. 38 appears abrupt, it must not be forgotten that, according to ver. 40, and from the nature of things, we have only a very brief summary of the discourse of Jesus.

Ver. 39. "*Now he said<sup>1</sup> this of the Spirit whom<sup>2</sup> they that believed on him<sup>3</sup> were to receive; indeed, the Spirit<sup>4</sup> was not yet,<sup>5</sup> because Jesus was not yet glorified.*"<sup>6</sup> Lücke and others criticise this explanation which John gives of the saying of Jesus. The future *πέσουσιν, shall flow,* they say, is purely logical; it expresses the consequence which must result from the act of faith. Moreover, the living water is the eternal life which the believer draws from the words of Jesus, and by no means the Holy Spirit. Reuss finds here a proof of the way in which the evangelist misapprehends the meaning and import of certain sayings of the Lord. Scholten thinks he can reject this passage as an interpolation. Certainly, if ver. 38 only reproduced the idea of ver. 37, the promise of Jesus might refer to a fact which had already occurred at the time of His speaking: comp. v. 24, 25, vi. 68, 69 (the profession of Peter). But we have seen that the promise of ver. 38 passes far beyond that of ver. 37, and must refer to a more advanced and more remote state of believers. The facts prove that if, until the day of Pentecost, the apostles were themselves able to quench their thirst in the presence of Jesus, they could not before that event quench that of any one besides. The *rivers of living water,* those streams of new life which flowed forth from the heart of believers by means of the spiritual gifts (the different *χαρίσματα, the gift of tongues, prophecy, teaching,*) all these signs of the dwelling of Christ in the Church by His Holy Spirit, appeared only after that day. Jesus distinctly marks this advance from the first state to the second in the passage xiv. 17, 18; and no one could

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  It<sup>all</sup>: *ελεγει* (*he was saying*), instead of *ειπεν* (*he said*).

<sup>2</sup> The Mjj. are divided between *ου* ( $\aleph$  D etc.) and *ο* (B E etc.).

<sup>3</sup> B L T read *πιστευσαντες* instead of *πιστευοντες* which is read by T. R. with 14 Mjj.

(among them  $\aleph$ ) Mn. It. etc.

<sup>4</sup> We reject *αγιον* (*holy*) with  $\aleph$  K T Cop. Orig. against the other Mjj. and Vss.

<sup>5</sup> B It<sup>pericope</sup> Sy<sup>rich</sup> add *δεδομενον* (*given*). D adds *εν' αυτοις*.

<sup>6</sup>  $\aleph$  reads *δεδοξαστο* instead of *εδοξασθη*.

understand better than John the difference between these two states. Let us remember St. Peter, the Twelve, the one hundred and twenty, proclaiming the wonderful things of God at Jerusalem, and bringing on that day three thousand persons to the faith! Nothing like this had taken place before. John also does not, as *Lücke* supposes, confound the Divine Spirit with the spiritual life which He communicates. The figure of *living water*, of which Jesus makes use, unites these two ideas in one conception: the Spirit, as the principle, and life, as the effect. The term "*he said this of . . .*," is broad enough to include this double reference. The strange expression *οὐπω ἦν*, *was not yet*, occasioned the gloss *δεδομένον*, *given*, of the Vatican MS. and of some MSS. of the Itala, and *ἐπ' αὐτοῖς*, *upon them*, of the Cambridge MS. This expression is explained by the words of Jesus: "*If I go not away, the Paraclete will not come to you*" (xvi. 7), and by all the words of chaps. xiv. and xvi. which show that the coming of the Spirit is the spiritual presence of Jesus Himself in the heart; comp. especially xiv. 17, 18. Until the day of Pentecost, the Spirit had acted *on* men both in the Old Covenant and in the circle of the disciples; but He was not yet *in* them as a possession and personal life. This is the reason why John employs this very forcible expression: "*The Spirit was not*," that is, as already having in men a permanent abode. *Weiss* supposes that the participle *δεδομένον*, *given*, might well be genuine, and that it may have been omitted because, according to 2 Cor. iii. 17, *Jesus* was made the subject of *ἦν*, *was*, in this sense: "Because Jesus was not yet spirit (pure spirit), since He was not yet glorified." But, in that case, why expressly repeat the subject *Jesus* in the following clause. And how unnatural is this comparison with the passage in Corinthians!

The relation which John establishes between the exaltation of Jesus and the gift of the Holy Spirit is explained in different ways. According to *Hengstenberg* and others, the *ἔδοξάσθη* designates the fact of the *death* of Jesus as the condition of the sending of the Spirit, because this gift implies the pardon of sins. The idea is a true one; but the term *to be glorified* is nowhere applied to the death of Jesus as such. In this sense, *ὑψοθῆναι*, *to be lifted up* (iii. 15; xii. 32, 34) would be necessary. According to *de Wette* and *Vinet*, in a fine passage from the latter which *Astic* quotes, the connection between the glorification of Jesus and Pentecost consists in the fact, that, if Jesus had remained *visibly* on the earth, the Church could not have walked by *faith* and consequently could not have lived by the Spirit. But in the word *ἔδοξάσθη* the emphasis is by no means on the putting aside of the flesh, but on the being clothed with glory. This remark seems to me also to set aside the explanation of *Lücke* and *Reuss*: "It was necessary that the veil of the flesh should fall, in order that the liberated spirit might freely manifest itself in the Church" (*Lücke*). It is neither the expiatory death nor the bodily disappearance which are laid down as the condition of Pentecost; it is the positive glorification of Jesus, His reinstatement, as man, in His glory as *Logos*. It is this supreme position which renders Him capable of disposing of the Spirit and of sending Him to His own. The truth expressed by John may also be pre-

sented in this other aspect. The work of the Spirit consists in making Christ Himself live in the heart of the believer. But it is evident that it is not a Christ who is not perfected, whom the Spirit is to glorify and to cause to live in humanity, but the God-man having reached His perfect stature. The epithet *ἅγιος*, *holy*, was probably added (see the variants) with the purpose of distinguishing the specifically Christian Spirit from the breath of God as it was already acting in the Old Covenant. By reading simply *πνεῦμα* one might take this word in the special sense in which it is so frequently used in the Epistles of St. Paul: the spiritual life as the fruit of the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church, *the spirit born of the Spirit* (iii. 6); this would facilitate the explanation of *was not yet*. Nevertheless, we do not think it possible to defend this meaning.

2. Vv. 40–44. The impressions of the Multitude.

Vv. 40–44. “*Some among the multitude,<sup>1</sup> who had heard these words<sup>2</sup> said, This man is of a truth the prophet. Others<sup>3</sup> said, This is the Christ. 41. But others said, Does the Christ then come out of Galilee? 42. Has not the Scripture declared that the Christ comes of the seed of David and from the village of Bethlehem, where David was? 43. So there arose a division in the multitude because of him, 44 and some of them would<sup>4</sup> have taken him; but no one laid hands on him.*” These brief descriptions of the impressions of the people, which follow each of the discourses of Jesus serve to mark the two-fold development which is effected and thus prepare the way for the understanding of the final crisis. These pictures are history taken in the act; how could they proceed from the pen of a later narrator? John has given us only the *résumé* of the discourses delivered by Jesus on this occasion. This is what he gives us to understand by the plural *τῶν λόγων*, *these discourses*, which, according to the documents, is to be regarded as the true reading. We know already who this prophet was of whom a portion of the hearers are thinking. Comp. i. 12; vi. 14. The transition from this supposition to the following one: *This is the Messiah*, is easily understood from the second of these passages.

As there were two shades of opinion among the well-disposed hearers, so there were also two in the hostile party: some limited themselves to making objections (vv. 41, 42); this feature suffices to isolate them morally from those previously mentioned. Others (ver. 44) already wished to proceed to violent measures. *De Wette, Weiss, Keim* ask why John does not refute the objection advanced in ver. 42, which it would have been easy for him to do, if he had known or admitted the birth of Jesus at Bethlehem. From this silence they infer that he was ignorant of or denied the whole legend of the Davidic descent of Jesus and His

<sup>1</sup> Instead of πολλοὶ οὖν ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου ἀκούσαντες which is read by T. R. with 11 Mj. Mnn. It<sup>alg</sup> Syr., in  $\aleph$  B D L T X It<sup>pl</sup> Coptic Vulg. Cop. Orig. ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου οὖν ἀκουσάντες is read.

<sup>2</sup> T. R. reads τὸν λόγον (*this word*) with S X A Mnn. The 13 other Mj. Mnn. It. Vulg.

Syr<sup>sch</sup> Cop. Orig. read τῶν λόγων (*these words*), and  $\aleph$  B D L T U add τούτων.  $\aleph$  D K II add αὐτων before or after λόγων.

<sup>3</sup> B L T X; οἱ δὲ instead of ἄλλοι ( $\aleph$  D etc.) or ἄλλοι δὲ (T. R. with Mnn.).

<sup>4</sup>  $\aleph$  ελεγον (*said*) instead of ἠθελον (*wished*).

birth at Bethlehem. But the evangelist relates his story objectively (*Weiss*), and it is precisely in the case of his believing the objection to be well founded that he would be obliged to try to resolve it. John often takes pleasure in reporting objections which, for his readers who are acquainted with the Gospel history, turn immediately into proofs.<sup>1</sup> At the same time he shows thereby how the critical spirit, to which the adversaries of Jesus had surrendered themselves had been a less sure guide than the moral instinct through which the disciples had attached themselves to Him. The γάρ, for (ver. 41), refers to an understood negative: "By no means, for . . ." The present ἐρχεται, comes, is that of the idea, the expression of what must be, according to the prophecy. ὅπου ἦν "where he was (his home);" comp. 1 Sam. xvi. 44. The some, according to *Weiss*, formed a part of the officers sent to take Him. But, in that case, why not designate them, as in ver. 45? They were rather some violent persons in the crowd who were urging the officers to execute their commission. To take Him, in the sense of causing Him to be taken.

3. Vv. 45-52. The Meeting of the Sanhedrim.

Vv. 45-49. "The officers therefore returned to the chief-priests and Pharisees. And they said to them, Why have you not brought him? 46. The officers answered, Never man spake like this man.<sup>2</sup> 47. The Pharisees answered them, Are you also led astray? 48. Has any one of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed<sup>3</sup> on him? 49. But this multitude, who know not the law, are accursed!"<sup>4</sup> Although this was a holy day, the Sanhedrim or at least a part of this body held a meeting, no doubt awaiting the result of the mission of the officers (ver. 42). The union of the two substantives under the force of one and the same article indicates strongly community of action (comp. ver. 32). The pronoun ἐκεῖνοι, properly *those there*, is surprising, since it refers to the nearest persons. *Weiss* and *Westcott* try to explain it by saying that the priests and Pharisees were morally further removed from the author than were the officers, as if the moral distance could take the place of grammatical remoteness. We find here again, more evidently than elsewhere, the pregnant sense of this pronoun in John; not: *those there* (in contrast to *these here*), but: those and not others; those, always the same, the eternal enemies of Jesus. By their frank reply (ver. 46) the officers, unintentionally, pay a strange compliment to these doctors whom they were accustomed every day to hear. *Tischendorf* has rightly restored, in his later editions, the last words of ver. 46; the omission of these words in the Alexandrian authorities arises from the confounding of the two ἀνθρώπος. By the *you also* (ver. 47), the rulers appeal to the vanity of their servants. John takes pleasure, in ver. 48, in again maliciously recalling one of these sayings of the adversaries of Jesus on which the contradiction made by facts impressed the stamp of ridicule (comp. the

<sup>1</sup> *Hilgenfeld* (*Eint.*, p. 719) distinctly acknowledges that the fact of the birth of Jesus in Bethlehem is implied in this passage as known by the author.

<sup>2</sup> B L T Cop. Orig. omit ως ουτος ο ανθρω-

πος, D Itallq read ως ουτος λαλει. N ως ουτος λαλει ο ανθρωπος.

<sup>3</sup> N D: πιστευει instead of επιστευσεν.

<sup>4</sup> N B T 2 Mnn. Orig.: επαρατοι instead of επικαταρατοι.

conduct of Nicodemus in ver. 50). The commentators recall, on the suggestion of ver. 49, the contemptuous expressions contained in the Rabbinical writings with reference to those who are uneducated. "The ignorant man is not pious; the learned only will be raised from the dead." We must also recall the expressions: "people of the earth," "vermin," etc., applied by the learned Jews to the common people. By the words: *who know not the law*, the rulers insinuate that for themselves they have unanswerable reasons derived from the law for rejecting Jesus. Sacerdotal wrath willingly assumes an esoteric mien. The reading *ἐπάραιτο* belongs to the classical style; the LXX. and the New Testament (Gal. iii. 10-13) use the form *ἐπικατάρατος*.

But there is one present who calls them to order in the name of that very law which they claim alone to know:

Vv. 50-52. "*Nicodemus, who came to him before by night*<sup>1</sup> *and who was one of them, says to them, 51. Does our law then condemn a man before*<sup>2</sup> *hearing from him and taking knowledge of what he does? 52. They answered and said to him, Art thou, then, thyself also, a Galilean? Search and see that out of Galilee arises*<sup>3</sup> *no prophet.*" The part which Nicodemus plays on this occasion is the proof of the advance which has been made in him since his visit to Jesus. This is noticeably indicated by the apposition, "*who came to Jesus before.*" The omission of these words in the Sinaitic MS. is probably owing to a confounding of *αὐτοῦς* and *αὐτόν*. *Νυκτός*, *by night*, is omitted by the Alexandrian authorities; but we may hold that it has for its aim to bring out the contrast between his present boldness and his former caution. The *πρῶτον* or *πρότερον*, *before*, which the Alexandrian authorities read in place of *νυκτός*, likewise establishes the contrast between his present conduct and his previous course. The second apposition: *who was one of them*, ironically recalls their own question, ver. 48: "Has any one of the rulers . . . ?"

The term *ὁ νόμος*, *the law*, ver. 51, is at the beginning of the sentence; it contains a cutting allusion to the claim of the rulers that they alone have knowledge of the law (ver. 49). The subject of the verbs *ἀκούσῃ* and *γινῶ* is the law personified in the judge.

We see in ver. 52 how passion regards and judges impartiality. It discovers in it the indication of a secret sympathy, and in this it is not always mistaken. The Sanhedrim maliciously assume in their reply that one cannot be an adherent of Jesus without being, like Him, a Galilean: "It must be that thou art His fellow-countryman to give up thyself thus to His imposture." The last words which the narrative places in the mouth of Jesus' adversaries seem to contain an assertion which is contrary to the facts of the case; for, it is claimed, several prophets, Elijah, Nahum, Hosea, Jonah, were of Galilean origin. Hence the conclusion has

<sup>1</sup> T. R. reads *ο ελθων νυκτος προς αυτον* with E G H M S P Δ. Italliq Vulg. Syr. In B L T Suh. *ο ελθων προς αυτον προτερον* is read; in D. *ο ελθων προς αυτον νυκτος το πρωτον*. **N** omits the whole,

<sup>2</sup> **N B M K L T X II** Orig. read *πρωτον* instead of *προτερον*.

<sup>3</sup> Instead of *εγγερεται*, **N B D K T Γ Δ II 30** Mm. Italicque Vulg. Syr. read *εγειρεται*,

been drawn (*Bretschneider, Baur*) that the members of the Sanhedrim, who must have known their own sacred history, could not have uttered these words, and that it is the evangelist who has wrongly attributed to them this error. If the perfect *ἐγήγερται, has arisen*, is read, we might with some writers understand the thought thus: "And see that a prophet has not (really) arisen in Galilee (in the person of this man)." There would thus be an allusion to the title *prophet of Galilee*, which was frequently given to Jesus. But this does not obviate the difficulty. For there still remains the phrase *ἐπεύνησον καὶ ἴδε, search and see that . . .*, which implies that the fact has not yet occurred. The more probable reading, the present *ἐγείρεται, does not arise*, also does not set aside the difficulty; for the proverb: "no prophet arises in Galilee" can only be an axiom resulting, according to them, from Scriptural experience ("search and thou shalt see"). The attempt at a complete justification of this appeal to history must be given up. Undoubtedly, the Galilean origin of three of the four prophets cited (Elijah, Nahum, Hosea) is either false or uncertain; see *Hengstenberg*. Elijah was of Gilead; Hosea, of Samaria, which cannot be identified with Galilee; Nahum, of El-Kosh, a place whose situation is uncertain. But Jonah remains. His case is an exception which passion might have caused the rulers to forget in a moment of rage and which, if it had been mentioned in the way of objection to the rulers, would have been set aside by them as an exception confirming the rule. Notwithstanding this isolated fact, Galilee was and still continued to be an outcast land in the theocracy. *Westcott*: "Galilee is not the land of prophets, still less of the Messiah." The gravest thing which they forget, is not Jonah, it is the prophecy Is. viii. 23-ix. 1, where the preaching of the Messiah in Galilee is foretold.

*The story of the woman taken in adultery: vii. 53-viii. 11.*

Three questions arise with regard to this section: Does it really belong to the text of our Gospel? If not, how was it introduced into it? What is to be thought of the truth of the fact itself?

The most ancient testimony for the presence of this passage in the New Testament, is the use made of it in the *Apostolical Constitutions* (i. 2, 24) to justify the employment of gentle means in ecclesiastical discipline with reference to *penitents*. This apocryphal work seems to have received its definitive form about the end of the third century. If then this passage is not authentic in John, its interpolation must go back as far as the third or the second century. The Fathers of the fourth century, *Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine*, admit its authenticity and think that it was rejected in a part of the documents by men who were weak in faith and who were afraid that "their wives might draw from it immoral inferences" (*Augustine*). Certain MSS. of the *Itala* (*Veronensis, Colbertinus*, etc.), from the fourth century to the eleventh, the *Vulgate*, the *Jerusalem Syriac* translation of the fifth century, the MSS. D F G K H U T, from the sixth century to the ninth, and more than three hundred Mm. (*Tischendorf*), read this passage, and do not mark it with any sign of doubtfulness. On the other hand, it is wanting in the *Peschito* and in two of the best MSS. of the *Itala*, the *Vercellensis*, of the fourth, and the *Brixianus*, of the

sixth century. *Tertullian, Cyprian, Origen, Chrysostom* do not speak of it.  $\aleph$  A B C L T X  $\Delta$ , from the fourth century to the ninth, and fifty Mnn., omit it entirely (L and  $\Delta$  leaving a vacant space); E M S  $\Lambda$  II and forty-five Mnn. mark it with signs of doubtfulness. Finally, in some documents it is found transposed to another place: one Mn. (225) places it after vii. 36; ten others, at the end of the Gospel; finally, four (13, 69, etc.), in the Gospel of Luke, after chap. xxi. *Euthymius* regards it as a useful addition; *Theophylact* rejects it altogether.

From the point of view of external criticism, three facts prove interpolation :

1. It is impossible to regard the omission of this passage, in the numerous documents which we have just looked at, as purely accidental. If it were authentic, it must necessarily have been omitted of design, and with the motive which is supposed by some of the Fathers. But, at this rate, how many other omissions must have been made in the New Testament? And would such a liberty have been allowed with respect to a text decidedly recognized as apostolic?

2. Besides, there is an extraordinary variation in the text in the documents which present this passage; sixty variants are counted in these twelve verses. *Griesbach* has distinguished three altogether different texts: the ordinary text, that of D, and a third which results from a certain number of MSS. A true apostolic text could never have undergone such alterations.

3. How does it happen that this entire passage is found so differently located in the documents: after ver. 36, at the end of our Gospel, at the end of Luke xxi. finally between chaps. vii. and viii. of our Gospel, as in the T. R.? Such hesitation is likewise without example with respect to a genuine apostolic text.

From the point of view of internal criticism, three reasons confirm this result :

1. The style does not have the Johannean stamp; it has much more the characteristics of the Synoptical tradition. The *ὄν*, the most common form of transition in John, is altogether wanting; it is replaced by *δέ* (11 times). The expressions *ὁρθρον* (John says *πρωί*), *πᾶς ὁ λαός, καθίσας ἐδίδασκέν, οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ φαρισαῖοι*, are without analogy in John, and remind us of the Synoptic forms of expression. Whence could this difference arise, if the passage were genuine?

2. The preamble vii. 53 presents no precise meaning, as we shall see. It is of a suspicious amphibological character.

3. Finally, there is a complete want of harmony between the spirit of this story and that of the entire Johannean narrative. The latter presents us in this part the testimony which Jesus bears to Himself and the position of faith and unbelief which His hearers assume on this occasion. From this point of view, the story of the woman taken in adultery can only be regarded as a digression. As *Reiss* very well says: "Anecdotes of this kind tending to a teaching essentially moral are foreign to the fourth Gospel." As soon as this passage is rejected, the connection between the testimony which precedes and that which follows, is obvious. It is expressly marked by the *πάλιν*, again, viii. 12, which joins the new declaration, viii. 12-20, to that of the great day of the feast, vii. 37 ff.

The authenticity of this passage is also no longer admitted, except by a small number of Protestant exegetes (*Lange, Ebrard, Wieseler*), by the Catholic interpreters (*Hug, Scholz, Maier*), and by some adversaries of the authenticity of the Gospel, who make a weapon of the internal improbabilities of the story (*Bretschneider, Strauss, B. Bauer, Hilgenfeld*). At the time of the Reformation it was judged to be unau-

thentic by *Erasmus*, *Calvin* and *Beza*; later, it was likewise expunged by *Grotius*, *Wetstein*, *Semler*, *Lücke*, *Tholuck*, *Olshausen*, *de Wette*, *Baur*, *Reuss*, *Luthardt*, *Ewald*, *Hengstenberg*, *Lachmann*, *Tischendorf*, *Meyer*, *Weiss*, *Keil*. According to *Hilgenfeld* (*Einleit. ins. N. T.*), this passage has in its favor preponderating testimonies; it places us in the very midst of the days which followed the great day of the feast; finally, it is required by the words of viii. 15. These arguments have no need to be refuted.

How was this passage introduced into our Gospel?

*Hengstenberg* attributes the composition of it to a believer who was an enemy of Judaism and who wished to represent, under the figure of this degraded woman whom Jesus had yet restored, the Gentile world pardoned by grace. In order to give more credit to this fiction, the author inserted it in the text of our Gospel with a preamble, and it found its way into a certain number of copies. But the allegorical intention which is thus supposed does not appear from any of the details of the story; besides, it is not exactly true that the woman was pardoned by Jesus. We shall give attention to the objections raised by *Hengstenberg* against the internal truthfulness of the story.

It is more simple to find in this passage the redaction of some ancient tradition. *Eusebius* relates (*H. E.*, iii. 40) that the work of *Papias* contained "the history of a woman accused before the Lord of numerous sins, a history which was contained also in the Gospel of the Hebrews." *Meyer*, *Weiss* and *Keil* call in question the existence of any relation between this story of *Papias* and that with which we are occupied. But they have nothing to object against the identity of the two except the expression: of *numerous sins*, used by this Father, as if this very vague term could not be applied to the woman of whom our narrative speaks. The exhortation of Jesus: "*Go, and sin no more*," undoubtedly does not refer to a single act of sin. For ourselves, it seems to us very difficult not to recognize in this story preserved by *Papias* that which is related in our pericope. A reader of *Papias* or of the Gospel of the Hebrews undoubtedly placed it as a note, either at the end of his collection of the Gospels, consequently at the end of John (hence its place in 10 Mnn.), or in a place which seemed to be suitable for it in the Gospel narrative, for example here, as an instance of the machinations of the rulers (vii. 45 ff.), or as an explanation of the words which are to follow viii. 15 ("*I judge no man*"), or indeed after Luke xxi. 38 (where it is found in 4 Mnn.), a passage which presents a striking analogy to our narrative (comp. especially viii. 1, 2 of John with this verse of Luke). It was made the close of that series of tests to which the Sanhedrim, and then the Pharisees and Sadducees had subjected Jesus on that memorable day of the last week of His life. If it was so, we may rank this story in the number of the truly historical, but extra-Scriptural narratives, which the oral tradition of the earliest times has preserved.

*Hützig* and *Holtzmann* have supposed that this passage originally formed a part of the writing which, according to them, was the source of our three Synoptics (the alleged *primitive Mark*), and that it was found there between the 17th and 18th verses of chap. xii. of our canonical Mark. Our three Synoptics omitted it, because of the indulgence with which adultery seemed to be treated in it. On the other hand, it found entrance into the Gospel of the Hebrews and by this door entered into our Gospels, in different places. But no explanation is given as to how in so short a time the sentiment of the Church could have completely changed, so that to a unanimous rejection there shortly succeeded so general a

restoration. Our explanation appears to us at once more natural and less hypothetical. Moreover, Holtzmann himself now gives up the hypothesis of the Proto-Mark.

The question as to whether this story is the tradition of an actual fact or a valueless legend can only be solved by the detailed study of the passage. We will give the translation according to the T. R., indicating only the principal variations.

Vii. 53-viii. 11. 53. "And every one went away<sup>1</sup> to his own house. Viii. 1. But Jesus went to the Mount of Olives. 2. And at the break of day, he came again<sup>2</sup> into the temple; and all the people<sup>3</sup> came to him; <sup>4</sup> and he sat down and taught them.<sup>5</sup> -3. Now the scribes and the Pharisees bring<sup>6</sup> to him a woman taken<sup>7</sup> in adultery; <sup>8</sup> and having set her in the midst of the company, <sup>4</sup> they say to him,<sup>9</sup> Master this woman has been taken in adultery, in the very act; <sup>10</sup> 5 now, in the law, Moses commanded<sup>11</sup> us to stone<sup>12</sup> such persons; as for thee therefore,<sup>13</sup> what dost thou say? 6. They said this to test him, that they might be able to accuse him; <sup>14</sup> but Jesus, stooping down, wrote with his finger on the ground.<sup>15</sup> 7. As they continued asking him, he lifted himself up<sup>16</sup> and said to them, He that is without sin among you, let him first<sup>17</sup> cast the stone at her. 8. Then he stooped down again and wrote on the ground.<sup>18</sup> 9. They having heard this<sup>19</sup> and being reproved by their conscience,<sup>20</sup> went out,<sup>21</sup> one by one,<sup>22</sup> beginning with the eldest even to the last; <sup>23</sup> and Jesus was left alone with the woman who was standing<sup>24</sup> in the midst of the company. 10. Then Jesus, lifting himself up<sup>25</sup> and no longer seeing any one but the woman,<sup>26</sup> said to her, Woman,<sup>27</sup> where are thine accusers? <sup>28</sup> Did no one condemn thee? 11. She said,<sup>29</sup> No one, Lord. Jesus said to her, Neither do I condemn<sup>30</sup> thee; go,<sup>31</sup> and sin no more."<sup>32</sup>

Ver. 53. Does the expression: *every one went away* refer, as seems natural from the context, to the members of the Sanhedrim, who return to their homes after the meeting, vii. 45-52? In that case, the remark is an idle one. Or does it

1 D M S Γ: επορευθησαν. U: απηλθεν. A: απηλθον.

2 D: παραγινεται. U: ηλθεν. Mnn. παρηλθεν.

3 G S U Mnn.: οχλος (the multitude).

4 5 Mj. omit προς αυτον (to him).

5 D 6 Mnn. omit the words και . . . αυτους (from and to teach).

6 Others: φερουσι, προσηνεγκαν.

7 E G H K: καταληφθεισαν, D: ειλημμενην.

8 D: επι αμαρτια (in sin).

9 E G H K add πειραζοντες (tempting him).

D: εκπειραζοντες αυτον οι ιερεις ινα εχωσιν κατηγοριαν αυτου.

10 U: ταυτην ενρομεν επ' αυτοφωρω.

11 D: εκελευσεν.

12 D M S U A: λιθασειν. Mnn.: λιθασεισθαι.

13 D συ δε νυν (but thou now).

14 S U: κατηγοριαν κατ' αυτου. D M omit the words τουτο . . . αυτου (from they to accuse).

15 E G H K 90 Mnn. add μη προσποιουμενος (without seeming to have seen or heard); some Mnn. (in Matthaei) και προσποιουμενος (and pretending to write).

16 D M S Vss.: ανευψεν και. U A: αναβλεψας (having raised his eyes).

17 E G H πρωτον (first).

18 U adds ενος εκαστου αυτων τας αμαρτιας (the sins of each one of them).

19 D: εκαστος δε των Ιουδαιων (each one of the Jews).

20 D M U A Mnn. Vss. omit the words και . . . ελεγχομενοι (from and to conscience).

21 L: εξηλθεν. M.: ανεχωρησαν.

22 D omits εις καθ' εις (one by one).

23 E G H K M Vss. omit εως των εσχατων (even to the last). D reads ωστε παντας εξελθειν (so that all went out).

24 All the Mj.: οσα instead of εστωσα.

25 A Mnn. αναβλεψας (having raised his eyes).

26 D M S omit the words και . . . γυναικος (from and to the woman). U A replace them by ειδεν αυτην και (he saw her and).

27 D E F G H K Vss. omit η γυνη (woman): M S U A: γυναι.

28 8 Mnn. and Augustine omit the words που . . . σου (from where to accusers); other variants.

29 D: κακεινη ειπεν αυτω (and she said to him).

30 E F G K Mnn.: κριτω (judge).

31 D: υπαγε.

32 D M U Vss. add απο του νυν before αμαρτανε (from henceforth before sin no more).

refer to the whole people who, when the feast was ended, returned from the temple to their dwellings. This meaning would in itself be more acceptable. It was perhaps the meaning of this verse in the context from which the story has been detached. But in the narrative of John nothing leads us to this meaning of the word *every one*. Herein is an indication of a foreign intercalation.

Viii. 1, 2. A striking analogy to the Synoptic narrative, both in the matter and the form; comp. Luke xxi. 38.

Vv. 3, 4. *Γραμματεῖς*, the scribes, is a *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον* in John; the Synoptic style. It is scarcely probable that already at that time these men, so proud of their knowledge, would have submitted to Him so grave a question and would have thus consented to concede to Him so great authority in the eyes of the whole people; comp. vii. 26.

Ver. 5. Stoning was ordained by Moses only for the case of an unfaithful *betrothed virgin* (Deut. xxii. 23, 24); for the adulterous *wife*, the kind of death was not determined (Lev. xx. 10). According to the Talmud, where the penalty is not specified, the law meant, not stoning, but strangling. And *Meyer* infers from this that this woman was an unfaithful betrothed virgin. This supposition is neither natural nor necessary. The declarations of the Talmud do not form a law for the time of Jesus. *Tholuck*, *Ewald* and *Keil*, as it seems to me, rightly hold, that where the law was silent, it was rather the punishment of stoning which was inflicted. This view is confirmed by vv. 2 and 27 of the chapter cited (Lev. xx.), where the penalty of death, not specified in ver. 10, is expressly designated as that by stoning. Comp. also Exod. xxxi. 4 and xxxv. 2, where the penalty of death is ordained for violators of the Sabbath, with Num. v. 32-34, where this punishment is inflicted, without any new determination having been given, under the form of stoning.

Ver. 6. In what did the snare consist? Some, *Augustine*, *Erasmus*, *Luther* and *Culvin* think that they desired to lead Jesus to pronounce a sentence whose severity would place it in contradiction to His ordinary compassion. Others, *Euthymius*, *Bengel*, *Tholuck*, *Hengstenberg*, *Weiss* and *Keil* suppose that the adversaries expected a decision in the line of clemency, which would have put Jesus in contradiction to the Mosaic statute. But, in both of these cases, there would have been no snare properly so called, no danger existing for Jesus except in case of an affirmative answer in the first explanation and of a negative answer in the second. *Hug* and *Meyer* suppose the snare more skillfully laid, that is to say, threatening Jesus on both sides. If He replies negatively, He contradicts Moses; if He replies in conformity with Moses, He enters into conflict with the Roman law which did not punish adultery with death. This appears to me to approach the truth. Only the Roman law has nothing to do here; for the Romans did not impose on the provinces their own legislation, and the conflict resultant from a simple contradiction between the two codes would have had nothing striking enough in the eyes of the people to seriously injure Jesus. The solution seems to me to be simple: If Jesus answered: Moses is right; stone her! they would have gone to Pilate and accused Jesus of infringing upon the rights of the Roman authority, which had reserved to itself the *jus gladii* here, as in all conquered countries. If He answered: Do not stone her! they would have derided Him before the people and would even have accused Him before the Sanhedrim as a false Messiah; for the Messiah must maintain or restore the sovereignty of the law. It is exactly the same combination as when the question was pro-

posed to Him of paying tribute to Cæsar (Luke xx. and parallels). *Luthardt* and *Weiss* also adopt this explanation. *Weiss* objects, it is true, that they could not reasonably expect from Jesus that He would give the order to stone her; and that, in any case, He could still reserve the confirmation of the penalty for the Roman authority. But in the case of a sentence of condemnation it would have been in vain for Jesus to place all the limitations upon this answer that were possible—no account would have been taken of this before the Roman governor. He had been accused indeed of forbidding to pay tribute to Cæsar, though He had answered in precisely the opposite way.

The act of Jesus in the face of the question which is proposed to Him is not simply, as it is frequently understood from certain examples derived either from the Greek authors or from the Rabbis, a way of isolating Himself and expressing His indifference with regard to the subject proposed. In the first place, it could not be an indifferent question for Jesus in such a situation. Then, notwithstanding all that *Weiss* says, it seems to me that *Hengstenberg* is in the true line of thought when he sees in this act, thus understood, a sort of trick incompatible with the moral dignity of Jesus. If He gave Himself the appearance of doing a thing, it was because He was really doing it. He *wrote*, and that which He wrote must quite naturally, as it seems to me, be the words which He utters at this same moment (ver. 7). He writes the first part of it while He is stooping down the first time (ver. 6), and the second part when, after having raised Himself, He resumes the same attitude (ver. 8). [Thereby Jesus takes the position of a divine judge both of the woman who is brought to Him and of the very persons themselves who present her to Him.] A sentence is not only pronounced: it is written. This act has a meaning analogous to that of the saying of Jeremiah (xvii. 13): "Those who turn aside from Me shall be written in the earth."

Vv. 7, 8. The admirable, yet at the same time very simple, art of the answer of Jesus in ver. 7 consists in bringing back the question from the *judicial* domain, where His adversaries were placing it, to the *moral* ground, beyond which Jesus does not dream for a moment of extending His authority; comp. Luke xii. 14. A judge in his official function may certainly pass judgment and condemn, though being himself a sinner. But such is not, at this moment, the position of Jesus, who is not invested with the official function of a judge. It is also quite as little the position of those who submit the question to Him. In order to have the right to make themselves of their own motion the representatives and executors of the justice of God, it would be necessary therefore, that at least they should themselves have been exempt from every sin which was fitted to provoke a like judgment against themselves. Undoubtedly it might be objected that in former times the entire people was called to condemn such criminals by stoning them. But the time when God committed to the people the function of judges in the case of similar crimes had long since passed. Jesus takes the theocracy, not as being in its ideal form, but such as He finds it, providentially deprived of its ancient constitution and subjected to the foreign yoke. The interpreters who, like *Lücke*, *Meyer*, and so many others, restrict the application of the term *without sin* to adultery or, in general, to impurity, misconstrue the thought of Jesus. In His eyes "he who has offended in the matter of one commandment, is guilty of all" (James ii. 10). The skill of this answer consists in disarming the improvised judges of this woman, without however infringing in the least upon the ordinance of Moses. On one side, the words: *let him cast the stone*, sustain the

code, but on the other, the words: *without sin*, disarm any one who would desire to apply it.

Ver. 9. If the Pharisees had been sincere in their indignation against the accused, it was the time to lead her to the presence of the officially constituted judge. But it was not the evil that they were set against: it was Jesus. Recognizing the fact that their design has failed, they take the only course which remains for them, that of withdrawing, and they make thus the tacit avowal of the odious intention which had brought them. *Πρεσβύτεροι* is not here an official name; it is the oldest who, as the most venerable representatives of public morality, had taken their place at the head of the company: *ἔσχατοι*, *the last*, does not mean the youngest or the last in respect to social position, but simply, as *Meyer* says, the last who left. The word *alone* implies only the departure of the accusers.

Vv. 10, 11. By the *οὐδὲ ἐγώ*, *neither do I*, Jesus gives the woman to understand that there was nevertheless one there who, without acting in contradiction to the rule of justice laid down in ver. 7, might really have the right of taking up the stone, if He thought it fit to do so; but this one even renounced it through charitable feeling and in order to leave her the opportunity of returning to virtue: "*Go, and sin no more.*" We must not see in the words of Jesus: *I do not condemn thee*, a declaration of pardon similar to that which He addresses to the penitent sinful woman in Luke vii. 48, 50. *Bengel* rightly remarks that Jesus does not say: "*Go in peace: thy sins are forgiven thee.*" For the sinful woman who is in question here did not come to Jesus by reason of a movement of repentance and faith. By not condemning her, Jesus simply grants her the opportunity for repenting and believing. It is a promise of forbearance, not justification; comp. Rom. iii. 24, 25 (*πάρεσις*). And by saying to her: *Sin no more*, He indicates to her the path on which alone she can really lay hold upon salvation.

Thus vanish all the moral difficulties and all the historical improbabilities which *Hengstenberg* and others claim that they find in this story. As *Reuss* says: "The authenticity of the fact seems to be sufficiently established." This incident is in every point worthy of the wisdom, holiness and goodness of Him to whom it is attributed. Jesus clearly distinguished the judicial domain from the moral domain; He wakened in His adversaries the consciousness of their own sinfulness, and He made this woman understand how she must use the opportunity of grace which is accorded to her. Finally, in the words: *Where are the accusers?* we think we hear, as it were, the prelude of that triumphant exclamation of the Apostle Paul: "Who shall accuse? Who shall condemn?" (Rom. viii. 33, 34.)

The internal characteristics of this inimitable incident of the life of Jesus locate it chronologically in the same period with the other analogous facts related by the Synoptics, that is to say, immediately after the entrance into Jerusalem on Palm-day (Luke xx.; Matt. xxii., etc.). It is, moreover, at this moment only that so explicit a recognition of the authority of Jesus on the part of the members of the Sanhedrim can be understood.

## 2. *Jesus, the light of the world: viii. 12-20.*

We find in this section: 1. A testimony (ver. 12); 2. An objection (ver. 13); 3. The answer of Jesus (vv. 14-19); 4. An historical notice (ver. 20).

Ver. 12. "*Jesus, taking up the discourse again, said to them: I am the light*

of the world; he who follows me shall not walk<sup>1</sup> in the darkness, but shall have<sup>2</sup> the light of life."—The *πᾶν*, again, can the less be a simple transition to a new discourse since it is placed at the beginning with a certain emphasis and is accompanied by *οὖν*, therefore, which would, in that case, be a useless repetition (in answer to *Weiss*). It announces therefore a new testimony, analogous to that of vii. 37 ff., as if John meant to say: "Jesus, after having thus applied to Himself a first symbol, takes up the discourse again for the purpose of applying to Himself a second." Was this new discourse given on the same day as the preceding one? According to *Weiss*, ver. 20 proves the contrary, because it indicates a new situation. But was Jesus obliged to remain during the whole day as if fastened to one spot? The term *ἐλάλησε*, *He spoke*, indicates a less solemn attitude and tone than the expressions *He opened His mouth and cried*, in vii. 37. This is a continuation, a complement of the preceding discourse; this circumstance speaks in favor of the identity of the day. In any case, it must be said with *Lutherdt*: "The historic thread which concerned the author was quite other than that of days and hours."

For what reason does Jesus designate Himself as the light of the world? *Hug* and others have thought that He alluded to the brightness which was shed forth by the two candelabras which were lighted at evening during the feast, in the court of the women, and the light of which, according to the Rabbis, shone over the whole of Jerusalem. This ceremony was very noisy; a sacred dance, in which grave men participated, took place around the candelabras; and it may be that Jesus made allusion to this solemn march in the following words: "He that followeth me shall not walk . . ." The singing and the music of instruments filled the temple; the festivity was prolonged even until daylight. The celebrated *Maimonides* affirms that this ceremony occurred on every evening of the feast, which would accord with the explanation of *Hug*. But the *Talmud* speaks of it only on occasion of the first evening. For this reason *Vitringa* and other commentators have thought that they must connect this saying rather with some prophetic passage which may have been read in the temple during that day; *Is. xlii. 6*: "*I will cause thee to be the covenant of the people, and the light of the nations.*" Comp. also *Is. xlix. 6, 9*. But it is not certain that there were regular readings from the Old Testament in the temple; even the existence of a synagogue in the sacred inclosure is doubtful (see *Lücke*). *Jarchi* speaks only of a synagogue "situated near the court, on the temple-mountain." And, above all, the saying of Jesus does not contain any sufficiently precise allusion to these prophetic passages. The commentators who hold that there is an allusion to the candelabras of the temple seem to me to commit the same mistake as in the explanation of the previous symbol (vii. 37 ff.). Thinking only of the ceremony which was celebrated in the time of Jesus, they forget what is much more important, the miraculous and beneficent

<sup>1</sup> Variation of *περιπατήσει* (T. R. with D E etc.) and *περιπατησῆ* (N B Γ etc.).

<sup>2</sup> N e read *εχει* (has) instead of *εξει*.

fact of which this ceremony was the memorial, and which was for Jesus certainly the essential point. The feast of Tabernacles, which at this time assembled the people together, was designed to recall to their minds the blessings of God during the sojourn in the wilderness. Hence, the tents of leafy branches under which they lived and which gave the name to the feast. Now among these blessings, the two greatest had been the water from the rock and the pillar of fire in the cloud. Jesus has just applied to Himself the first of these types. He now applies to Himself the other (hence the *πάλιν*, ver. 12). It is thus that Jesus celebrates the feast of Tabernacles, translating it, in some sort, into His own person. Only Israel is henceforth the whole world, the *κόσμος*, as in chap. vi. Jesus was the manna, not for the people only, but for humanity, and in vii. 37, the living water for *whosoever* is athirst. We have already explained in i. 4 and iii. 19 the term *light*; it is the perfect revelation of moral good, that is to say, of God, the living good. The expression: "*He that followeth me shall not walk . . .*," alludes, not to the torch-dance in the court, but to the pilgrimage of Israel in the desert. The people arose, advanced, stopped, encamped, at the signal which came from the luminous cloud; with such a guide, there was no more darkness for the travelers. Thus are the obscure things of existence, the night which the selfish will and passions spread over his life, dissipated for man from the moment when he receives Jesus into his heart. At every step, he begins by looking to Him, and he finds in Him the revelation of holiness, the only real truth. The *light of life* does not signify that which consists in life or which produces it, but that which springs from it (i. 4); a light which radiates from the life in communion with God and which directs the exercise of the understanding. The future *περιπατήσει*, in the Received Text, is probably a correction in accordance with the following *ἔξει*. The conjunctive aorist must be read *ὃν μὴ περιπατήσῃ*; comp. x. 5. The use of the form *ὃν μὴ* is founded upon the natural distrust of the heart: "It is *not to be feared*, whatever may be its own darkness, that it will be compelled still to walk in the night." *Ἐξει*: it will possess internally.

There is a profound connection between this testimony and that which precedes. In vii. 37, Jesus presented Himself as the life (*ἰδὼν ζῶν*); in viii. 12, He offers Himself as the light which emanates from the life. As to the response which man should make to these divine gifts, in the first passage it is the receptivity of faith (*shall drink*); in the second, the activity of practical obedience (*shall walk*).

Ver. 13. "*The Pharisees therefore said to him, thou bearest witness of thyself; thy witness is not true.*" *Lücke* and *Weiss* infer from the words *the Pharisees*, that the pilgrims had already departed from Jerusalem. But why could not the Pharisees have been among the multitude present at the feast? This last word: *is not true*, does not signify: "is false," but: "is not sufficiently guaranteed, not worthy of credit." There was a Rabbinical adage which said indeed: "No man bears witness of Himself." The objectors raise only a question of form; they are undoubtedly somewhat intimidated by the Lord's tone of authority. They might have quoted to Him

His own word of v. 31: "If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true." Jesus treats first the question of substance (ver. 14); then, that of form (vv. 15-18).

Ver. 14. "*Jesus answered and said to them; Even if I bear witness of myself, my witness is true, because I know whence I came and whither I go; but<sup>1</sup> you know not whence I come or<sup>2</sup> whither I go.*" Jesus had accepted in chap. v. the position of an ordinary man; this is the reason why he had cited in His favor the double testimony of the Father, through the miracles and through the Scriptures. Here, He asserts Himself and claims His true position, which He had voluntarily abandoned. This difference arises from the fact that the rupture between Him and His hearers is now further advanced. He asserts Himself more categorically. The inner light which He possesses with regard to His person places Him absolutely beyond the illusions of pride. And this is the reason why He is, at the same time, the light for others. The term *οἶδα*, *I know*, designates that unchangeably clear and transparent consciousness which Jesus has of Himself; it bears at once on the place of His origin and of that to which He would return, on the beginning and the end of His existence. He who distinctly knows these two limits of His life comprehends it altogether. Jesus is distinctly conscious of Himself as of a being coming from on high and returning on high, and as one for whom, consequently, the earthly life is only a passing period with a mission to fulfill, a transition from heaven to heaven. The whole of Christianity rests upon this consciousness which Jesus had of His person. It is the heroism of faith to give oneself up to the extraordinary testimony which this being has borne to Himself. The words: "*you know not,*" are more than the announcement of a fact; they contain a reproach. They also could know, if only they had their minds open to perceive. In the heavenly and holy character of the appearance of Jesus, every upright heart can discern the divinity of His origin as well as that of His destination. The disjunctive particle *ἢ*, *or*, in the second clause (see the critical note) is more forcible than the simple *καί*, *and*, in the first: Jesus adds knowledge *to* knowledge; hence the *and*; but as for them, when they are inquired of with reference to one point *or* another, they show always the same ignorance; hence the *or*.

Vv. 15, 16. "*You judge according to the flesh; I judge no one; 16 and if I judge, my judgment is true,<sup>3</sup> because I am not alone, but I and the Father<sup>4</sup> that sent me.*" The objection of the Pharisees, ver. 13, contained a judgment respecting Jesus. They treated Him as an ordinary man, as a sinner, like themselves. They accused Him of overrating Himself in the testimonies which He bore to Himself. It is to this that the charge refers: "*You judge according to the flesh.*" We must not confound *κατὰ τὴν σάρκα*, "*according to the flesh,*" with *κατὰ σάρκα*, *in a fleshly way*. The *flesh* here is not

<sup>1</sup> F H K omit δε.

<sup>2</sup> We translate according to the reading η in B D K T U X A. Καί is read in T. R. after N E F G H L and many Mnn.

<sup>3</sup> T. R. reads αληθης with 12 Mj. (N Γ Δ etc.), and nearly all the Mnn., while B D L T X read αληθινη.

<sup>4</sup> N D omit πατηρ after ο πεμφας με.

the veil extended before the eyes of the one who judges falsely (the carnal spirit or mind); it is rather, according to the article *τῆν*, the appearance marked by weakness of the one who is the object of judgment, by reason of which, at first sight, he is not at all distinguished from other men. The first sense, however, is included in the second, for with a less carnal heart the Jews would have discerned in Jesus, under the covering of the flesh, a being of a higher nature and would have accorded to Him, in the midst of mankind, a place by Himself. This superficial estimate of which Jesus sees Himself to be the object on their part, awakens in Him the feeling of a contrast. While these blind persons allow themselves to make their estimate of Him, with a perfect confidence in their own light, He, the incarnate light, judges no one. Thus, those who are ignorant allow themselves to judge, while He who knows denies Himself this right. And yet, it cannot be denied, Jesus judges also; He Himself declares it in ver. 16. Writers have put themselves to great pains to explain this contradiction. The word *no one* has been paraphrased in this way: "No one, according to the outward appearances" (the flesh); so *Cyril*. Or, what amounts to nearly the same thing: "No one . . . as you judge me" (*Lücke*). Or again: "No one now, in contrast with the judgment to come" (*Augustine, Chrysostom*<sup>1</sup>). But according to these views, there is an addition of what is not said. Or, without an ellipsis and in the sense of iii. 17: "The principal aim of my coming, is to save; and if in exceptional cases I judge, it is only with reference to those who will not allow themselves to be saved" (*Calvin, Meyer, Astié, Luthardt, Weiss, Keil, Westcott*, with different shades of explanation). But the idea of these exceptional judgments is definitely excluded by the *οὐδένα*, *no one*, of ver. 15. *Reuss* makes iii. 18 apply here: "No one, because those who are judged have judged themselves." But how then are we to explain the words: *And if I judge?* To all these opinions I should prefer that of *Storr*, who translates *ἐγώ*, *I*, in the sense of *I alone*. Comp. ver. 26. What Jesus charges upon the Jews is that they think themselves competent to judge Him by themselves and according to their own light (*ὑμεῖς*, *you*). "As for me," Jesus means to say, "in so far as I am left to myself, reduced to my own human individuality, I do not allow myself anything of the kind; as such I judge no one." It is the same thought, in a negative form, as that of v. 30 in an affirmative form: "As I hear, I judge." The emphasis would thus be upon the pronoun *ἐγώ*, *I*, which its position in the sentence, indeed, makes prominent. And Jesus could thus add, without contradicting Himself, ver. 16: "And yet if I judge." For then, it is not really *He* who judges, since He does nothing but pronounce the sentences which He has heard from His Father. This is the sense which I formerly adopted. On weighing well the import of the word *οὐδένα*, *no one*, however, I ask myself whether Jesus did not mean that He judges *no individual*, in the

<sup>1</sup> *Hilgenfeld (Einleit. p. 728)* goes even so far as to infer from this verse that "the fourth Gospel rejects all outward judgment," and that according to it "the reign of the Spirit ends

directly at the last day." These conclusions are arbitrary, and place the writer in contradiction to himself (v. 27-29).

sense that He pronounces on no one a final sentence; and if He judges the moral state *of the people* and the character of the acts of which He is a witness, these sentences which He pronounces are dictated to Him by His Father. We come back thus to the preceding sense, indeed, but by another path (the contrast of the individual with the people and with things). The received reading *ἀληθῆς*, *worthy of faith*, is more appropriate to this context than the variant of some Alexandrian and Greco-Latin authorities, *ἀληθινῆ*. Jesus does not intend to say that, in these cases, the sentence which He gives is a *real* sentence, but that it is a *true* sentence, to which one can trust. Thereby He returns to the idea from which He started, the truth of His testimony concerning Himself, and to the question of form which had been proposed to Him. He confirms the answer which He has just given by an article of the code:

Vv. 17, 18. "*And besides it is written*<sup>1</sup> *in your law that the testimony of two men is worthy of belief. 18. I bear witness of myself, and the Father who sent me bears witness of me.*" Jesus enters, at least in form, into the thought of His adversaries (as in vii. 16, 28). The Mosaic law required two witnesses, for testimony to be valid (Deut. xvii. 6; xix. 15). Jesus shows that in the judgments which He pronounces on the world (ver. 16), as well as in the testimonies which He bears to Himself (ver. 18), He satisfies this rule; for the Father joins His testimony to His own. Where the eye of the flesh can see only one witness, there are really two. This testimony of the Father is generally referred to the miracles, according to ver. 36. But the connection with ver. 16 leads us to a much more profound explanation. Jesus describes here a fact of His inner life, as in v. 30. The knowledge which He has of Himself and of His mission (ver. 12) differs essentially from the psychological phenomenon which is called in philosophy the fact of consciousness; it is in the light of God that He contemplates and knows Himself. Herein is the reason why His testimony bears, in the view of every one who has a sense for perceiving God, the stamp of this divine authority.<sup>2</sup> In the expression: *your law*, the adversaries of the authenticity have found a proof of the Gentile origin of the author (*Baur*). *Reuss* formerly explained it by the spirit of our Gospel, which has as its end in view nothing less than "a lowering and almost a degradation of the old dispensation." We have been able to judge from

<sup>1</sup> *Σ* reads *ὑεγραμμενον εστι* instead of *ὑεγραπται*.

<sup>2</sup> An anecdote will perhaps explain this saying of Jesus better than any commentary. About 1660, Hedinger, chaplain of the Duke of Wurtemberg, took the liberty, at first privately and then publicly, to censure his sovereign for a grave fault. The latter enraged sent for him, resolved that he would punish him. Hedinger, strengthened by prayer, repaired to the presence of the prince, bearing on his face the expression of the peace of God and in his heart the sense of His presence. After having looked at him attentively, the

prince said to him: "Hedinger, why did you not come alone, as I ordered you?" "I am alone, your Highness." "No, you are not alone." "Pardon me, your Highness; but I am alone." The Duke persisting with an increasing agitation, Hedinger said to him: "Certainly, your Highness, I came alone; but whether it has pleased my God to send an angel with me I cannot say." The Duke dismissed him without inflicting any injury upon him. The living communion of this servant of God with his God was a sensible fact even to the one whom passion exasperated.

the close of chap. v. as to what is the value of these assertions. *Weiss*, *Keil*, *Reuss* himself (now) see in this *your* an accommodation: "This law on which you rest at this moment for condemning me." I think rather, notwithstanding what *Weiss* and *Keil* say, that Jesus, in expressing Himself thus, is inspired by the feeling of the exceptional position which He is claiming in all this section. As He nowhere says, *our Father* (not even in the address of the Lord's Prayer), but: *your Father*, Matt. v. 16, 45, 48; vi. 8, 15, 32, etc.), or, when He wished to express the divine fatherhood at once with reference to Himself and to us: "*My Father and your Father*" (xx. 17), because God is not His Father in the sense in which He is ours, so no more can He say: *our law*, uniting under one and the same epithet His own relation and that of the Jews to the Mosaic institution. Who does not feel that He could not, without derogation, have said in vii. 19: "Has not Moses given *us* the law?" Jesus was conscious of being infinitely elevated above the entire Jewish system. His submission to the law was undoubtedly complete, but it was free; for His moral life was not dependent on the relation to an external ordinance. The word *men* is not found in the Hebrew text; this term, whatever *Weiss* may say, must have been added intentionally; it was suggested by the contrast between the human witnesses whom the law demanded, and the divine witness whom Jesus here introduces (*the Father who sent me*). In this judicial form Jesus expresses at the foundation the same thought as when He spoke in ver. 16 of the inner certainty of His own testimony. The idea of this entire passage is the following: "You demand a guaranty of that which I am saying of myself and of you; behold it: It is in God that I know myself and that I assert myself, as it is in Him that I know you and judge you." And it is in virtue of this divine light which shines within Him and by means of which He also knows others, that He is present as the *light of the world* (ver. 12). A fact so spiritual could hardly be understood by every one; hence the following:

Ver. 19. "*They said to him therefore, Where is thy father? Jesus answered, You know neither me nor my Father; if you knew me, you would know my Father also.*" *Therefore*: "In consequence of this declaration." These discourses of Jesus are of so lofty import, that they sometimes produce upon us the effect of monologues, in which Jesus lays hold anew upon Himself and displays the treasures which He discovers in the centre of His being. The disciples themselves could only get glimpses of their meaning. John gathers them together as enigmas which the future would have to solve. But is not the same thing true at this hour, in the midst of the Christian Church, with reference to many of the words of the apostles? How many baptized persons comprehend what St. Paul said of the inner witness of the Spirit (Rom. viii. 16)? Thus the question of the hearers of Jesus has nothing inadmissible in it, as *Reuss* asserts. Jesus spoke of a second witness; but a witness must be seen and heard. Otherwise, what purpose does he serve? And how can we fail to suppose, in that case, that he who invokes such testimony is a dreamer or an impostor? *Luthardt*: "It is as if they wished to intimate that every liar can also appeal

to God." The meaning of the question seems to me to be this: "If it is of God that thou art speaking, let Him make Himself heard; if it is of some one else, let him show himself." The answer of Jesus means that it is impossible for Him to satisfy their demand. The living presence of God in a human being is a fact which cannot be perceived by the senses; but if they possessed the spiritual organ necessary for understanding this Jesus who manifests Himself to them, they would soon discern in Him the God who is in intimate communion with Him; and they would not ask: "Where is He?" Comp. xiv. 10.

Ver. 20. "*Jesus spoke these words as he was teaching near the treasury, in the temple; and no one laid hands on him, because his hour was not yet come.*" The position which the words ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα, these words, occupy at the beginning of the sentence, gives them, notwithstanding the denial of Weiss, an emphatic sense: words of such gravity. Even the recollection of the locality in which they had been uttered had remained deeply engraved in the memory of the evangelist. The term γαζοφυλάκιον, treasury, probably designates, by reason of the preposition ἐν, in, the whole place where were deposited the sums collected for the maintenance of the temple and for other pious uses. It appears from Mark xii. 41, and Luke xxi. 1, that the trunks or chests of brass, thirteen in number, which were designed to receive the gifts of the faithful, were properly called by this name. They were in the court of the women, and bore, each of them, an inscription indicating the purpose to which the money which was deposited in it was consecrated. It was before the one which was designed for the poor that Jesus was sitting, when He saw the widow cast into it her mite. It is probable that the apartment called treasury was that in which were kept the sums coming from these trunks, and that it was near these trunks. This locality was almost contiguous to that in which was the famous hall called Gazith, where the Sanhedrim held its meetings, between the court of the women and the inner court (Keil, Handb. der bibl. Archäol. I., p. 146, note 13). This last circumstance explains the importance which the evangelist attaches to the indication of this locality (vii. 45-52). It was, in some sort under the eyes and in the hearing of the assembled Sanhedrim<sup>2</sup> (vii. 45-52), that Jesus was teaching when He uttered such words. The expression in the temple serves to make prominent the sacred character of the locality indicated: in the treasury, in the midst of the temple at Jerusalem! The and which follows evidently takes, in this connection, the sense of: and yet. If there was a place where Jesus found Himself under the hands and at the mercy of His enemies, it was here; but their arm was still paralyzed by their conscience and by the public favor which gathered around Jesus.

### 3. "It is I." viii. 21-29.

Jesus had just applied to Himself the two principal symbols which the feast presented to Him. The following testimony completes the

<sup>1</sup> X omits διδασκων εν τω ιρω.

these expressions which he seems to take literally. It belongs to me to be astonished.

<sup>2</sup> Weiss criticises with an exclamation point

two which precede; it is a more general affirmation respecting His mission.

Vv. 21, 22. "Jesus said therefore to them again,<sup>1</sup> I go away and you shall seek me and you shall die in your sin; whither I go, you cannot come. 22. The Jews therefore said, will he kill himself? for he said, whither I go, you cannot come." The *therefore* seems to allude to the liberty which Jesus continued to enjoy (ver. 20), notwithstanding His preceding declarations. There is nothing to prevent our admitting that this new testimony also was given on the same day, the last and great day of the feast. It was the last time that Jesus found Himself in the midst of His whole people assembled together, before the feast at which he was to shed His blood for them. On the morrow, this multitude was about to disperse to all parts of the world. To this situation the grave and sorrowful tone of this discourse fully answers.

Ver. 21 admonishes the hearers of the importance of the present hour for the people and for each individual: Jesus, their only Saviour, is to be with them only for a little while longer. When once they have rejected Him, heaven, whither He is about to return, will be closed to them; there will remain for them nothing but perdition. This declaration is a more emphatic repetition of vii. 33, 34. As *Meyer* says, the *seeking* of the Jews will not be that of faith; it will be only the longing for external deliverance. The words *ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ὑμῶν*, *in your sin*, indicate the state of inward depravity, and consequently of condemnation, in which death will overtake them; Jesus alone could have delivered them therefrom. *Hengstenberg* and others translate: *by your sin*. This sense of *ἐν* is possible; but the former sense is better suited to the singular substantive. *Sin* is here the wandering of the heart, the estrangement from God, in general; in ver. 24, it will be the particular manifestations of this disposition. In xiii. 33, Jesus speaks to the apostles, in the same terms as here, of the impossibility of following Him; but for them the impossibility will be only temporary (*ἄρτι*, *at this hour*), for Jesus will return to seek for them (xiv. 3). For the Jews, on the contrary, there will be no longer a bridge between earth and heaven; the separation is made complete by the rejection of Him "without whom no one comes to the Father" (xiv. 6). In their turn, and as if by a sort of retaliation, the Jews go beyond the answer which they had made to His preceding declaration, vii. 35. "Certainly," they say, "if it is to Hades that thou meanest to descend, we have no intention of following Thee thither." This ridicule may be explained without the necessity of having recourse to the idea that a special punishment awaited in Hades those who took their own lives (*Josephus*, *Bell. Jud.*, iii. 8. 5). The following words are intended to explain to them the: *you cannot*, which irritates them:

Vv. 23-25. "And he said<sup>2</sup> to them, you are from beneath, I am from above; you are of this world, I am not of this world. 24. Therefore I said to you, that you shall die in your sins; for, if you do not believe<sup>3</sup> that I am he, you

<sup>1</sup> ⚭ : ελεγεν ουν instead of ειπεν ουν παλιν.

<sup>3</sup> ⚭ D read μου after πιστευσητε.

<sup>2</sup> ⚭ B D L T X : ελεγεν instead of ειπεν.

shall die in your sins. 25. They said therefore to him, Who art thou? Jesus said<sup>1</sup> to them, Precisely that which I also declare to you." Jesus lets their jesting go unnoticed. He continues the warning which was begun in ver. 21. An abyss separates them from Him; this is the reason why He cannot serve them as a Saviour and raise them with Himself to heaven, His own country. The parallelism between the expressions: "from beneath" and "of this world" (ver. 23) does not permit us to include in the former the idea of Hades. We must rather see in the first antithesis: *from beneath* and *from above*, the opposition of *nature*, and in the second: *of this world* and *not of this world*, the contrast of disposition and moral activity. The *world* designates human life constituted independently of the divine will and consequently in opposition to it. One may be *from beneath* (by nature), without being *of the world* (by tendency), in case the soul attains to the desire of the higher good. The negative form: *I am not of this world*, expresses forcibly the repugnance inspired in Jesus by this whole course of human life, which is destitute of the divine inspiring breath.

Their perdition is consequently certain, if they refuse to attach themselves to Him, for He alone could have been for them the bridge between *beneath* and *above*. The brief clause by which Jesus formulates the contents of faith: "If you believe not *that I am . . .*" (literally), is remarkable because of the absence of a predicate. The whole attention is thus evidently directed to the subject, ἐγώ, *I*: "that *it is I* who am . . . and no other." It seems to me difficult to suppose that, in using this expression, Jesus is not thinking of that by which Jehovah often expresses what He is for Israel (e. g. Deut. xxxii. 39; Is. xliii. 10: *kî aui hou*, literally, *for I am He*). As has been said: in this word is summed up by God Himself the whole faith of the Old Testament: "I am your God, besides whom there is no other." In the same way, Jesus sums up in this word the whole faith of the new covenant: "I am the Saviour besides whom there is no other." It is remarkable that in the passage in Deuteronomy, the LXX. use, for the translation of these words, precisely the same Greek expression which we find here: *ιδετε οτι ἐγώ εἰμι*; which leads us to think that Jesus used the same Hebrew expression as the Old Testament. The understood predicate was certainly *the Christ*. But Jesus carefully avoided this term, because of the political coloring which it had assumed in Israel: The hearers could understand paraphrases such as these: He whom you are expecting: He who alone can answer the true aspirations of your soul; He who can save you from sin and lead you to God. But this word *Christ* which He carefully avoids is precisely the one which His hearers desired to wrest from Him; this is the aim of their question: *who art thou then?* In other words: "Have at last the courage to speak out plainly!" His enemies might indeed use to their advantage as against His life an express declaration on His part on this decisive point.

The reply of Jesus is one of the most controverted passages in the

<sup>1</sup> B D read ουν after ελεπε.

Gospel. There are two principal classes of interpretations, in accordance with the two chief meanings of ἀρχή: *beginning* (temporal) and *origin* (substantial or logical). In the first class must be reckoned that of *Cyril, Fritzsche, Hengstenberg*: "From eternity (ἀρχή, i. 1), I am that which I declare unto you." But why not, instead of the unusual phrase τὴν ἀρχήν, simply say ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, as in 1 John i. 1? Then, in this sense, would not the perfect λελάληκα have been more suitable than the present λαλῶ? Besides, the thought of Jesus would in any case have been altogether impenetrable for His hearers. The Latin Fathers, e. g., *Augustine*, translated as if it were the nominative: "who art thou? *The beginning* (the origin of things)." There would be but one way of justifying this sense grammatically; it would be to make the accusative τὴν ἀρχήν a case of attraction from the following ὅτι: "The beginning, that which I also say to you." But the construction, as well as the idea, remains none the less forced. *Tholuck*, abandoning this transcendental sense of ἀρχή, applies this word to the beginning of Jesus' ministry: "I am what I have unceasingly said to you ever since I began to speak to you." But why not simply say ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, as in xv. 27? And it must be admitted that the inversion of τὴν ἀρχήν cannot well be explained, any more than can the καί, also, before λαλῶ. There remains, in the temporal sense of ἀρχή, the explanation of *Meyer*. He holds that there is at once an interrogation and an ellipsis: "What I say to you concerning Myself from the beginning (is this what you ask me)?" The ellipsis is as forced as the thought is idle. And how can we explain the καί, the choice of the unusual term τὴν ἀρχήν, and the use of the present λαλῶ, instead of the perfect λελάληκα which would certainly be better suited to this meaning? The interpreters who give to ἀρχή a *logical* sense and make τὴν ἀρχήν an adverbial phrase: *before all, in general, absolutely*, are able to cite numerous examples drawn from the classic Greek. Thus *Luthardt* and *Reuss*: "At first, I am what I say to you"—which means: "This is the first and only answer that I have to give to you. If you wish to know who I am, you have only to weigh, *in the first place*, my testimonies respecting My own person." The sense is good; but to what subsequent way of explaining Himself would this *in the first place* allude (see, however, below)? And why not, in this sense, simply say πρῶτον (Rom. iii. 2)? *Chrysostom, Lücke, Weiss, Westcott* explain thus: "In general, why do I still speak with you?" Understand: "I do not myself know" (Lücke), or: "This is what you should ask me." I confess that I do not understand how it is possible to put into the mouth of Jesus anything so insignificant. Then, if we could overlook these ellipses, which are, however, quite unnatural, what are we to do with the ὅτι? Are we to take it in the sense of τί or διατί, *why, or because of what?* *Weiss* acknowledges that the examples from the New Testament which are cited for one of these senses (e. g., Mark ix. 11), are not to be thus explained. The only analogous use of this word seems to me to be found in the LXX., 1 Chron. xvii. 6; comp. with 2 Sam. vii. 7. Is this sufficient to legitimate this use in our passage? Moreover, the very rare phrase τὴν ἀρχήν is not sufficiently justified on this interpretation. The

only logical sense of this expression which seems to me probable is that which *Winer* has defended in his *Grammar of the New Testament* (§ 54, 1) and to which *de Wette*, *Brückner*, *Keil*, etc., have given their adhesion, and in the main *Ituss* also: "Absolutely what I also declare unto you," that is to say: "neither more nor less than what my word contains." Jesus appeals thus to His testimonies respecting His person as the adequate expression of His nature. "Fathom my *speech* and you will discern my *nature*." This sense fully accounts for the minutest details of the text: 1. The striking position of the word *τὴν ἀρχήν*, *absolutely*; 2. The choice of the pronoun *ὅτι* *all that which*: "whatever it may be that I may have said to you;" they have only to sum up His affirmations respecting Himself, the light of the world, the rock from which flows the living water, the bread which came down from heaven . . . , etc., and they will know what He is; 3. The particle *καί*, *also*, which brings out distinctly the identity between His nature and His speech; 4. The use of the verb *λαλεῖν*, *to declare*, instead of *λέγειν*, *to say, to teach*. As *Keil* well says in reply to *Weiss*: "His *λαλεῖν* does not designate what He has said of Himself on this or that occasion; it is His *discourse* in general, presented as an adequate expression of His nature;" finally, 5. The present tense of the verb, which gives us to understand that His testimonies are not yet at their end. It is objected, it is true, that *τὴν ἀρχήν* does not have this sense of *absolutely* except in negative propositions. But, in the first place, the sense of the proposition is essentially negative: "Absolutely *nothing else* than what I declare." And can we demand of the New Testament all the strictness of the classical forms? Besides, *Baümlein* cites the following example from Herodotus: *ἀρχὴν γὰρ ἐγὼ μηχανήσομαι* (i. 9, 1), an example whose value seems to be but little diminished by the fact that the phrase is followed by a negative proposition. This explanation seems to me indisputably preferable to all the others. I still ask myself, however, whether we cannot revert to the temporal sense of *ἀρχή*, *beginning*, and in that case explain: "*To begin*, that is to say, *for the moment*," and find the *afterwards* or *at the end*, which should correspond to the beginning, in ver. 28: "When you shall have lifted up the Son of man, *then* you shall know . . ." At present, Jesus reveals Himself only by His *speech*; but when the great facts of salvation shall have been accomplished, then they will receive a new revelation still more luminous. If this relation between ver. 25 and ver. 28 seems forced, we must, as I think, abide by the preceding explanation. We omit a multitude of explanations which are only varieties of the preceding meanings, or which are too entirely erroneous to make it possible to consider them.

The application of this answer of Jesus was that the thorough examination of the testimony which He bore continually to Himself was enough to lead to the discovery therein of His nature and of His mission as related to Israel and to the world. On this path, one will learn to know Him successively as the true temple (chap. ii.), as the living water (chap. iv.), as the true Son (chap. v.), as the bread from heaven (chap. vi.), etc. And in this way it is that His name *Christ* will be in a manner spelled out, letter after letter, in the heart of the believer, and will formulate itself

there as a spontaneous discovery, which will be worth infinitely more than if he had learned it in the form of a lesson from an outward teaching. To be salutary indeed, this profession: "Thou art the Christ," must be, as in the case of Peter (vi. 66-69), the fruit of the experiences of faith. Comp. Matt. xvi. 17: "Flesh and blood have not revealed it unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven." Such was the way in which the homage of Palm-day arose. Jesus never either sought or accepted an adhesion arising from any other origin than that of moral conviction. This reply is one of the most marvelous touches of Jesus' wisdom. It perfectly explains why, in the Synoptics, He forbade the Twelve to say that He was the Christ.

Vv. 26, 27. "*I have many things to speak and to judge concerning you; but he who sent me is worthy of belief, and what I have heard from him,<sup>1</sup> that do I speak<sup>2</sup> to the world. 27. They understood not that he spoke to them of the Father.*"<sup>3</sup> Some interpreters, ancient and modern, have tried to connect this verse grammatically with the preceding, by making the last words of that verse: *ὅτι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν*, a parenthetical clause, and the first words of ver. 26, *πολλὰ ἐγὼ*, the continuation of the clause which was begun with *τὴν ἀρχὴν* (so *Bengel, Hofmann, Bäumlein*): "For the moment—since it is still the time when I am speaking with you—I have many things to say to you" (*Hofmann*); or: "Certainly I have—a thing which I am also doing—many things to say to you" (*Bäumlein*). But this sense of *τὴν ἀρχὴν* is absolutely idle; and no less so that of the parenthetical clause. The attempt has also been made to connect ver. 26 logically with ver. 25. Thus *Luthardt* and *Reuss* introduce this antithesis: "It is of *yourselves* (not of myself) that I have to speak to you, and this will be for you a much more important thought to occupy your minds." But what was there of more serious importance for them than to know who Jesus was? *Weiss* finds a contrast between the idea: that it was not worth while to speak to them any longer (ver. 25), and the idea of the multitude of things which He had to say to them (ver. 26). This explanation falls together with the sense which *Weiss* gives to ver. 25. In my view, ver. 26 does not continue the thought of ver. 25. It is united with ver. 24. After having answered the question of the hearers in ver. 25, Jesus takes up again the course of His charges in vv. 21-24. In these verses he had uttered stern truths with reference to the moral state of the people; He simply continues in ver. 26: "Of these declarations and these judgments I have still *many*' (*πολλά*, at the beginning of the clause) to pronounce with regard to you." What is to follow in this same chapter, vv. 34, 37, 40, 41, 43, 44, 49, 55, gives us an idea of these many judgments which Jesus had in mind. "*But*," He adds, "painful as this mission may be for me, I cannot abstain from speaking to you as I do, for I only obey herein Him who dictates to me my message; now He is the truth itself, and my office here below can only be that of making the world hear what He reveals to me." From

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  reads *παρ' αὐτῷ* (with him) instead of *παρ' αὐτοῦ*. F G etc.) and *λαλῶ* ( $\aleph$  B D etc.).

<sup>3</sup>  $\aleph$  D 3 Mm. Italic Vulg. add *τὸν θεόν* at the end of the verse.

<sup>2</sup> The MSS. are divided between *λεγῶ* (E

*Chrysostom* to *Meyer*, some explain the opposition expressed in the word *but* by this idea: "I have much to say to you; but *I refrain*, and this because you are unwilling to receive the truth." But with this sense, to what purpose make appeal to the divine truth which forces him to speak and *to say to the world* what He hears from above. And in what follows, does Jesus keep silence? Does He not, on the contrary, make the greatest number of charges and the most severe ones against His hearers that He has ever addressed to them? With reference to *ἤκουσα*, *I heard*, comp. v. 30. This past tense cannot, either in accordance with this parallel or with the context, refer to the pre-existent state. Jesus certainly cannot mean that He heard in heaven, before coming here below, the charges which He now addresses to the Jews.

Ver. 27. Criticism declares the want of understanding of the Jews which is mentioned in ver. 27 impossible. Can those of whom John speaks, then, be, as *Meyer* thinks, new hearers who had not been present at the previous discourses? Or must we understand with *Lücke*: They were not willing to acknowledge that it was the Father who really made Him speak in this way; or with *Weiss*: They did not understand that He had the mission to reveal the Father by declaring what He inwardly heard from Him. These are manifest tortures inflicted on the text. The *ἔλεγεν* cannot be taken here in the same sense as in vi. 71: *to speak of*. It must be observed that in this whole discourse from ver. 21, Jesus had spoken of *Him who sent Him*, without once pronouncing the name either of God or of the Father. Now among the multitude there might be found hearers who were unable to imagine so close a relation between a human creature and the infinite God as that of which Jesus was bearing witness, and who consequently asked themselves whether He did not mean to speak of some one of the persons who were to precede the Messiah and with whom Jesus sustained a secret relation, as the Messiah was to do with Elijah. Think of the strange misunderstandings attributed by the Synoptics to the apostles themselves! After eighteen centuries of Christianity, many things in the discourses of Jesus appear evident to us, which, through their novelty and the opposition which they encountered from inveterate prejudices, must have appeared strange in the extreme to the greater part of His hearers. No doubt, if the heart had been better disposed, the mind would have been more open.

To this want of intelligence in His present hearers, Jesus opposes the announcement of the day when the full light will come among them respecting His mission, after the great national crime which they are on the point of committing.

Vv. 28, 29. "*Jesus therefore said to them,*<sup>1</sup> *when you have lifted up the Son of man, then shall you know that I am he and that I do nothing of myself, but that I speak these things*<sup>2</sup> *to you according to the teachings of my*<sup>3</sup> *Father, 29 and that he that sent me is with me; the Father*<sup>4</sup> *has not left me alone, because*

<sup>1</sup> B L T omit αυτοις after ελεγεν, and N D add παλιν.

<sup>2</sup> N: ουτως instead of ταυτα.

<sup>3</sup> Μου is omitted by N D L T X Itplerique.

<sup>4</sup> N B D L T X 5 Mnn. Itplerique Vulg. Cop. reject ο πατηρ after μου.

*I do always that which is pleasing to him.*" The lifting up of the Son of man refers especially to the death on the cross; this appears from the second person: *you have lifted up*. But Jesus could not hope that the cross would by itself cause the scales to fall from the eyes of the Jews and extort from them the confession: It is He! It could not produce this effect except by becoming for Him the stepping-stone to the throne and the passage to glory. The word *to lift up*, therefore, contains here the same amphibology as in iii. 14, and the second person of the plural assumes thus a marked tinge of irony: "When by killing me you shall have put me on the throne. . . ." The term *Son of man* designates that lowly appearance which is now the ground of His rejection. The recognition of Jesus here predicted took place in the conscience of all the Jews without exception when, after the sending of the Holy Spirit, the holy and divine nature of His person, of His work and of His teaching was manifested in Israel by the apostolic preaching, by the appearance of the Church, and then, finally, by the judgment which struck Jerusalem and all the people. At the sight of this, the want of understanding came to its end whether they would or not, and was transformed into faith in some, in others into voluntary hardening. This recognition never ceases to be effected in Israel by reason of the spectacle of the development of the Church; it will end in the final conversion of the nation, when they will cry out with one voice, as if on a new Palm-day: "*Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord*" (Luke xiii. 35). What calm dignity, what serene majesty, in these words: *Then you shall know . . . !* They recall, as *Hengstenberg* remarks, those grave and menacing declarations of Jehovah: "Mine eye shall not pity thee . . . and ye shall know that I am the Lord," Ezek. vii. 4. Comp. the same form of expression, Ezek. xi. 10; xii. 20; Exod. x. 2, etc. *Weiss* compares with this saying the word of Jesus respecting the sign of Jonah (Matt. xii. 39 ff.). A still more striking parallel in the Synoptics seems to me to be the word addressed to the Sanhedrim, Matt. xxvi. 64: "*You shall see the Son of man seated at the right hand of power and coming on the clouds of heaven.*" Some interpreters claim that John should have written *ὅτως*, *thus*, instead of *ταῦτα*, *these things*. But the thought is this: "and that I declare to you *these things* (*ταῦτα*) which you hear, according to (*καθώς*) the teaching which I have received from the Father." The expression is therefore correct. The whole of the end of the verse depends on *γινώσθε*, *you shall know*. Jesus here sums up all His preceding affirmations, while presenting them by anticipation as the *contents* of that future recognition which He announces: "*that I am he;*" comp. ver. 24: "*that I do and teach nothing of myself;*" comp. vii. 16, 17. This verse therefore means: "You yourselves will then say *amen* to all these declarations which you so lightly reject at this hour."

It appears to me natural to make the first clause of ver. 29 also depend on the verb, *You shall know*; it sums up the declarations of viii. 16-18. The following clause then reproduces very forcibly (by *asyndeton*) this last affirmation: *is with me*. In contrast with the present which escapes Him, Jesus with assured confidence lays hold of the future: "You may reject

me if you will, yet the Father remains in inner communion with me, as I have said to you, and He will protect my work." One might be tempted to understand the words *οὐκ ἀφῆκε* in this sense. "In sending me, He has not suffered me to come alone here below; He has willed to accompany me Himself." This indeed would be the most simple sense of the aorist. But in this case, how are we to understand what follows: "*Because I do always that which is pleasing to Him?*" Hengstenberg, who explains thus, has recourse to the divine foreknowledge: "He has not suffered me to come alone, since He well knows that I am faithful to Him in all things." This sense is evidently forced. We must therefore understand the aorist *ἀφῆκε* in the sense in which we find it in the passage, Acts xiv. 17: "*God has not left Himself without witness.*" "God has, in no moment of my career, left me to walk alone, because at every moment He sees me doing that which pleases Him." An instant therefore, a single one, in which Jesus had acted or spoken of His own impulse would have brought a rupture between Him and God; God would have immediately withdrawn from Jesus Himself, and that in the measure in which this will of His own was fixed within Him. The voluntary and complete dependence of Christ was the constant condition of the co-operation of the Father; comp. the words of x. 17 and xv. 10, which express in the main the same thought. Certainly, if the evangelist had written his Gospel to set forth the theory of the Logos, he would never have put this saying into the mouth of Jesus. For it seems directly to contradict it. The communion of the Son and the Father is regarded here as resting upon a purely moral condition. But we see by this how real was the feeling which Jesus had of His truly human existence, and how John himself has taken for granted the humanity of his Master. *Τὰ ἀρεστά*, that which is pleasing to Him, designates the will of the Father, not from the point of view of the articles of a code, but in that which is most spiritual and inward in it. Indeed, this term does not express the contents only of the *doing* of Jesus, but its motive. He did not only *what* was pleasing to the Father, but He did it *because* it was pleasing to Him. It is proved by this saying that Jesus had the consciousness, not only of not having committed the least positive sin, but also of not having neglected the least good, and that in His feelings as well as in His outward conduct.

Here is one of the passages where we can make palpable the fact that the discourses of Jesus in the fourth Gospel are not compositions of the writer, but real discourses of Christ. 1. The communion with God which Jesus affirms can only be a real historical fact. It cannot have been invented by the author. If it were not in the experience, it would not be in the thought. 2. The allusion to the Jewish law (vv. 17, 18), in order to justify a fact of so inward a nature, contains a surprising accommodation, which necessarily implies the historical surroundings in which Jesus taught. 3. The locality indicated with so much precision in ver. 20 testifies of a perfectly accurate historical recollection; otherwise, there would be here a piece of charlatanism, which it would be impossible to reconcile with the seriousness of the whole narrative.

## 4. "I and you": viii. 30-59.

Jesus, in His second discourse (vv. 12-20) attributed to Himself two modes of teaching: *testimony*, by which He reveals His origin, His mission, His work, and *judgment*, by which He unveils the moral state of His hearers. In this sense He had also said, ver. 26: "*I have yet many things to say and to judge concerning you.*" These more severe judgments which Jesus bore in His mind respecting the moral state of His people, we find expressed in the first section of the following discourse; it is *judgment* reaching its culminating point (vv. 30-50): you are not free; you are not children of Abraham; you are not children of God, but of the devil. Such are the severe judgments which are gradually introduced in the conversation between Jesus and even the least ill-disposed of His hearers. The second part is that of *testimony*. Jesus rises to His greatest height: He is the destroyer of death; He is before Abraham (vv. 51-59).

1. The judgment of Jesus respecting Israel: vv. 30-50.

And first its state of slavery: vv. 30-36.

Vv. 30-32. "*As Jesus spoke thus, many believed on him. 31. Jesus therefore said to those Jews who had become believers on him: If you abide in my word, you shall be really my disciples, 32 and you shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.*" The term "*believed*" designates here undoubtedly the disposition, openly expressed, to acknowledge Jesus as the Messiah. In this quite considerable number of believers, there were perhaps some members of the Sanhedrim; xii. 42: "*Many of the rulers believed on him.*" They perceived indeed that, in the words which Jesus had just uttered, there was something else than a vain boast. But Jesus is no more dazzled by this apparent success than he had been by the confession of Nicodemus (iii. 1, 2), and by the enthusiasm of the Galilean multitude (vi. 14, 15). Instead of treating these new believers as converts, He puts them immediately to the test by addressing to them a promise which, notwithstanding its greatness, presents a profoundly humiliating side. It is thus that Jesus often acts. At once, the one whose faith is only superficial stumbles at the holiness of the new word and falls; the one whose conscience has been laid hold of perseveres and penetrates farther into the essence of things. The particle *therefore* in ver. 31, sums up in a word the connection of ideas which we have just developed.

This new scene can scarcely have taken place on the same day with the preceding. Ver. 31 is explained in the most natural way by holding that those of the stranger pilgrims who had believed had departed on the day after the feast, and that, at this moment, Jesus was surrounded only by believing hearers who had until then belonged to the Jewish party. We are surprised, at the first glance, to meet in this gospel a connection of words such as *Jews who had become believers*. But this *contradictio in adjecto* is intentional on the part of the author; it is even the key of the following passage. These believers, at the foundation, belonged to the party of the adversaries; they were indeed still really Jews; they continued to share in the Messianic aspirations of the nation; only they were

disposed to recognize in Jesus the man who had the mission to satisfy these aspirations. Theirs was nearly the condition of mind of the Galilean multitude, at the beginning of chap. vi. Undoubtedly, these Jewish believers were not all of the *πολλοί*, *many*, of the preceding verse, but only a group among them, as *Weiss* and *Westcott* think. In the view of the latter, the difference between the two limiting words, *αὐτῷ*, *him*, and *εἰς αὐτόν*, *on him*, ver. 30, is explained even by this fact. But the meaning seems to me rather: They believed on him (as the Messiah) because they for a moment put confidence in His word (*him*).

The nature of the promise made in vv. 31, 32, is admirably fitted to the end which Jesus proposes to Himself. He knows that emancipation from the Roman yoke is the great work which is expected of the Messiah; He therefore spiritualizes this hope, and presents it under this more elevated form to the heart of the believers. The pronoun *ὑμεῖς*, *you*, has as its aim to contrast these new disciples with the unbelieving multitude. According to *Weiss*, this word serves rather to place them in opposition to the *true* believers among the *πολλοί*; but this distinction was not sufficiently marked. We might also see here a contrast with the early disciples. The first sense is the most natural. The expression *to abide in* contains the idea of persevering docility. There will be for this rising faith obstacles to be overcome. The Word will find in their hearts inveterate prejudices; a relapse into unbelief is therefore for them, though believers, a serious danger. By this figure: *to abide in*, the revelation contained in the word of Jesus is compared to a fertile soil in which true faith must be rooted ever more deeply in order to thrive and bear fruit.

Ver. 32. *Kaí*: and on this condition. They will really possess the quality of disciples; and on this path they will reach the complete illumination from which will result within them complete emancipation. The *truth* is the contents of the word of Jesus; it is the full revelation of the real essence of things, that is to say, of the moral character of God, of man, and of their relation. This new light will serve to break the yoke, not of the Roman power, but, what is more decisive for salvation, of the empire of sin. On what, indeed, does the power of sin in the human heart rest? On a fascination. Let the truth come to light, and the charm is broken. The will is disgusted with that which seduced it, and, according to the expression of the Psalmist, "the bird is escaped from the snare of the fowler." This is the true Messianic deliverance. If there is to be another more external one, it will be only the complement of this.

Vv. 33, 34. "*They answered him, We are Abraham's seed, and have never been slaves of any one; how sayest thou: you shall become free?* 34. *Jesus answered them, Verily, verily I say to you that whosoever commits sin is a slave [of sin<sup>1</sup>].*" According to some modern interpreters, those who thus answer Jesus cannot be the believing Jews of ver. 30, the more since Jesus charges them in ver. 37 with seeking to put Him to death, and, subsequently, calls them children of the devil. *Lücke* therefore

<sup>1</sup> D b omit της αμαρτίας (of sin.)

regards vv. 30-32 as a parenthesis, and connects ver. 33 with the preceding conversation (ver. 29). *Luthardt* thinks that in the midst of the group of well-disposed persons who surrounded Jesus, there were also adversaries, and that it was these latter who at this moment began to speak. Others give to the verb an indefinite subject: "They answered Him." But, on all these views, the narrative of John would be singularly incorrect. In reading ver. 33, we can only think of the believers of vv. 30-32. We shall see that the last words of ver. 37, also, do not allow any other application. It was not for no purpose that the evangelist had formed so marvelous a union of words in our Gospel as that of *believing Jews*. In these persons there were two men: the nascent believer—it was to him that Jesus addressed the promise vv. 31, 32—and the old Jew still living: it is the latter who feels himself offended, and who answers with pride (ver. 33). There was in fact a humiliating side in this word: *will make you free*. It was to say to them: you are not so. Making this step backward, they fell back into solidarity with their nation from which they had only superficially and temporarily separated themselves. The key of this entire passage is found already in these words, ii. 23, 24: "And many in Jerusalem believed on His name . . .; but Jesus did not *intrust Himself to them*." Under their faith He discerned the old Jewish foundation not yet shattered and transformed. In order that the promise of vv. 31, 32 should have been able to make a chord vibrate in their heart, they must have known experiences like those which St. Paul describes in Rom. vii.: the distress of an earnest, but impotent, struggle with sin. Jesus discerned this clearly, and for this reason He spoke to them, in ver. 31, of *abiding*, that is to say, of persevering in submission to His word. There is no confusion in John's narrative; we must rather admire its sacred delicacy.

The slavery which the hearers of Jesus deny cannot be of a *political* nature. Had not their fathers been slaves in the land of Egypt, in bondage, in the times of the Judges, to all kinds of nations, then subjected to the dominion of the Chaldeans and Persians? Were they not themselves under the yoke of the Romans? It is impossible to suppose them so far blinded by national pride as to forget facts which were so patent, as *de Wette*, *Meyer*, *Reuss*, etc., suppose; the last writer says: "They place themselves at the point of view, not of material facts, but of theory . . . There was submission to the Roman dominion . . ., but under protest." But the words: *we were never*, do not allow this explanation. *Hengstenberg*, *Luthardt*, *Keil*, give to this expression a purely *spiritual* import; they apply it to the *religious* preponderance which the Jews claimed for themselves in comparison with all other nations. This is still more forced. The hearers of Jesus cannot express themselves in this way except from the view-point of the *civil* individual liberty, which they enjoyed as Jews. Hence the connection between the two assertions: "*We are Abraham's seed; we were never in bondage*." With a single exception, which was specially foreseen, the law forbade the condition of bondage for all the members of the Israelitish community (Lev. xxv.). The dignity of a free man shone on the brow of every one who bore the name

of child of Abraham, a fact which assuredly did not prevent the possibility that Jewish prisoners should be sold into slavery among the Gentiles (in answer to *Keil*). The question here is of inhabitants of Palestine such as those who were in conversation with Jesus. These Jews, when hearing that it was *the truth* taught by Jesus which should put an end to their bondage, could not have supposed that this declaration applied to emancipation from the Roman power. Now as, along with this national dependence, they knew no other servitude than civil or personal slavery, they protested, alleging that, while promising them liberty, Jesus made them slaves. They changed the most magnificent promise into an insult; "and," as Stier says, "thus they are already at the end of their faith." We can see whether Jesus was wrong in not trusting to this faith.

Ver. 34. The genitive τῆς ἀμαρτίας *of sin*, is omitted by the *Cambridge MS.*, and an important document of *the Itala*; without this complement, the sense is: "*He is a slave, truly a slave, while believing himself a free man;*" a sense which is perfectly suitable. If, however, with all the other documents, the complement: *of sin* is sustained, it must be understood: "*He is a slave, I mean a slave of sin.*" The sin to which the man at first freely surrenders himself becomes a master, then a tyrant. It ends by entirely confiscating his will. The passage Rom. vi. 16-18 presents an idea analogous to that of these words. The present participle ὁ ποιῶν, *who commits (sin)* unites the two notions of act and condition; the act proceeds from the condition, then it establishes it. It is a slavery for which the individual is responsible, because he has himself coöperated in creating it. The genitive *of sin* brings out the degrading character of this dependence; the following clause shows the terrible consequence of it:

Vv. 35, 36. "*The slave does not abide in the house for ever; the son abides for ever.*"<sup>1</sup> 36. *If therefore the Son makes you free, you will be free indeed.*" If in ver. 34 the words τῆς ἀμαρτίας, *of sin*, are read, it is necessary to admit a change of meaning in the idea of slavery between ver. 34 and ver. 35. In ver. 34, the master is sin; in vv. 35, 36, the master is God, the owner of the house. This modification in the notion of moral slavery is undoubtedly to be explained by a thought which is also that of some passages in the Epistles of St. Paul: that the slave *of sin*, when he is a member of the theocracy, of the house of God, is made thereby a slave *with respect to God Himself*. In this moral condition, indeed, his position is servile; he renders to the master of the house only a forced obedience, because his will is governed by another master, sin. It cannot be denied, however, that the connection would be much more simple, if the words *of sin* were omitted in ver. 34. "He who commits sin is not a child, but a slave (with respect to God), ver. 34. Now, in such a moral state, the man possesses no permanent abode in the house of God (ver. 35). Separated spiritually from the Father of the family, he is not a real member

<sup>1</sup> X Γ omit the words ο υἱος μενει εις τον αιωνα (*the son abides for ever*); no doubt, a confounding of the two εις τον αιωνα.

of the family." The meaning is thus perfectly simple.—ὄν μένει: "He will remain in the house only as long as the master shall desire to make use of him" (*Luthardt*); he may be sold at any moment. What a threatening for those to whom Jesus was addressing Himself!—In contrast to this term *slave*, the term *son* must designate the *quality* of son; not the person of the Son. He who is truly a son through the community of spirit with the Master cannot be at all detached from that of which he has become an organic member. He can no more be separated from the kingdom of God than a child can be sold into slavery. But from ver. 36 the term Son is evidently applied to Jesus only. This is because in this house the filial dignity and the individual Son are mingled in one. There is here properly only *one* son, he who bears in himself the whole *gens*; all the rest become sons only by the act of *manumissio*, of, liberation, on his part (ver. 32). Just as the passage Gal. iv. 21–31 seems to be only a development of ver. 35, so Rom. viii. 2: "The law of the Spirit of life in Jesus Christ made me free (*ἡλευθέρωσέ με*) from the law of sin and death" is the commentary on ver. 36. It is to the Son as the representative and heir of the paternal fortune that the right is committed by the Father of freeing the slaves. ὄντως ἐλεύθεροι, *really*, that is to say, spiritually free in God, and consequently true members of His house and for ever.

Jesus has set aside the haughty assertion of ver. 33: *We were never in bondage*. He goes back now to the claim which was the point of support for that assertion: *We are Abraham's seed*, and He disposes of this also.

The moral sonship of Israel: vv. 37–47.

Vv. 37, 38. "I know indeed that you are Abraham's seed; but you seek to kill me, because my word makes no progress in you. 38. As for me, I speak that which<sup>1</sup> I have seen with the Father; <sup>2</sup> and you do the things which<sup>3</sup> you have heard from your father." <sup>4</sup> Jesus does not deny the genuineness of the civil registers in virtue of which His hearers affirm their character as children of Abraham. But He alleges a moral fact which destroys the value of this physical filiation in the spiritual and divine domain; it is their conduct towards Him and His word. Jesus here employs a method like that of John the Baptist, Matt. iii., and that of Paul, Rom. ix. By reason of the resistance which they oppose to His teaching, He addresses them as persons who have already returned to the solidarity of that Israelitic community which is desiring to make way with Him. Hence the charge which has been regarded as so strange (comp. vv. 31, 32): "You seek to kill me." But what more proper than the announcement of such a crime to make them feel the necessity of breaking finally the bond which

<sup>1</sup> Ⲛ B C D L X Orig. some Mnn. Cop. read α (*the things which*) instead of ο (*that which*) which is read by T. R. with E F G H K M S T U T Δ Δ Mnn. It. Syr.

<sup>2</sup> B D L T X Orig. reject μου, which is read by T. R. with the other MSS. and almost all the Vss.

<sup>3</sup> Ⲛ B C D K X (not L) read α (*the things which*) in the second clause. T. R. reads ο

(*that which*) with the others.

<sup>4</sup> B C K L X 15 Mnn. Cop. Orig. (frequently) read ηκουσατε παρα του πατρος (*the things which you have heard from the father*); T. R. with Ⲛ D E F G etc. Italicque etc.: εωρακατε παρα του πατρι (*the things which you have seen with your father*). B L T omit υμων after του πατρος.

still united them to a people so disposed. What justifies this severe assertion of Jesus is that He has just discovered, at this very moment, the impression of irritation produced in them by His word (ver. 33). The word *χωρεῖν* has two principal meanings: one, transitive, *to contain* (ii. 6)—this meaning is inapplicable here,—the other, intransitive: *to change place, to advance*. This verb is applied in this sense to water flowing, to a dart piercing, to a plant growing, to one body penetrating another, to invested money paying interest. Starting from this second meaning, some have explained: “has no place in you for developing itself,” or: “has no entrance, access to you” (*Ostervald, Rilliet*). The former translation is not suitable for the word *χωρεῖν*; comp. 2 Cor. vi. 12; *ὃν χωρεῖτε τὸν λόγον* would have been necessary. With the second, these words would apply only to persons who have already manifested a beginning of faith. We must therefore explain, with *Meyer, Weiss, Keil*: *makes no progress in you*. The word of Christ struck in them, from the first uttered words, against national prejudices which they still shared with their fellow-countrymen, against the *Jewish heart* which they had not laid aside; like the seed which fell on the rocky ground, it had been blighted as soon as it had begun to germinate. This is the reason why Jesus had said at the beginning, “If you abide.” Yet once more, there is no inaccuracy in the narrative. For him who goes to the foundation of things and who judges of the facts by placing himself at the point of view of Jesus and of John himself, everything is perfectly connected and well-founded.

In ver. 38, Jesus explains the resistance which His word encounters in them by a moral dependence in which they are and which is of a nature contrary to that in which He Himself lives. In speaking as He does, He obeys the principle which governs Him; they, in acting as they do, are the instruments of a wholly opposite power. In order to decide between the numerous various readings which are presented by the text of this verse, it is natural to start from this principle: that the copyists have sought to conform the two parallel clauses to one another, rather than to introduce differences between them. If we apply this rule, we shall arrive at the text which seems to us also to present the best sense intrinsically. It is that of the MS. K (with the exception, perhaps, of the pronoun *μου* which is read by this MS. in the first clause, and which may be rejected according to the principle suggested). This text of K is that which we have rendered in the translation.<sup>1</sup> The expression: *that which I have seen with my Father*, does not refer, as *Meyer, Weiss* and others think, to the state of the Lord's divine pre-existence; the parallel clause: *that which you have heard from your father*, excludes this explanation. For the two facts compared must be of a homogeneous nature. *Weiss* alleges the difference introduced intentionally by the change of the verbs (*see, hear*). But ver. 40 and v. 30 prove that no intention of this sort occasions this difference of expression. The question here is of a fact of incalculable importance in all human life. Behind the particular acts which are at

<sup>1</sup> Ἐγὼ οὐ εἶρακα παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς λαλῶ· καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν ἀκούσατε παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν ποιεῖτε.

the surface in the life of each man, there is concealed a permanent basis and, if I may venture to speak thus, a mysterious *anteriority*. All personal and free life has communication in its depths with an infinity of good or of evil, of light or darkness, which penetrates into our inner being and which, when once received, displays itself in our works (words or acts). This is what Jesus here represents under the figure of the paternal house whence we come forth and whence, as a son with his father, we derive our principles, our conduct, our habits: "From my *speaking* and from your *doing*, one may clearly see from what house we come forth, you and I." This is not all: at the foundation of each of these two infinities, good or evil, with which we are in ceaseless relation and of which we are the agents, Jesus discerns a *personal* being, a directing will, the *father* of a family who reigns over the whole house (*my Father, your father*). It is from him that the initiative on each side starts, that the impulses emanate. And as the moving power is personal, the dependence in which we are placed as related to it is also free, not inevitable. Jesus by His fidelity cultivates His communion with *the Father*; so He finds in this relation the initiative of all good ("that which I have seen")—the perfect: "*that which I am having seen* with the Father." The Jews, through their spirit of pride and hypocrisy, maintain in themselves this relation to the opposite principle, to the other father; so they continually receive from him the impulsions to every species of perverse works ("that which you have heard").

The *therefore* which unites the two parallel clauses has certainly a tinge of irony, as *Meyer* acknowledges: "You are consistent with the principle with which you are in communication, in doing evil, just as I am with mine in speaking what is good." The rejection of the pronoun *μου* after *πατρι* characterizes God as the sole Father in the true sense of the word. The singular pronoun *ὁ*, *that which*, in the first clause, answers to, the thorough unity and the consistent direction of the will towards good. There is in it no vacillation, no contradiction. The plural pronoun *ἃ*, *the things which*, characterizes, on the contrary, the capricious inconsistency of the diabolical volitions. This contrast is connected with that of the perfect *έώρακα* and the aorist *ήκούσατε*: the former designating a man who *is* what he is through the fact of having beheld; the latter, a variety of particular and momentary inspirations. The choice of the two terms *see* (Jesus) and *hear* (the Jews), to designate the two opposite kinds of moral dependence, is no less significant. *Sight* is the symbol of a clear intuition, such is only possible in the domain of the divine light and revelation. "In thy light we see light" (Ps. xxxvi. 10). The term: *to hear from* applies, on the contrary, to the secret suggestions which the perfidious mouth of an impostor whispers in the ear of his agents. Evil is the night in which one hears, but does not see. There is nothing even to the contrast of the two prepositions *παρά* (with the dative) *with*, and *παρά* (with the genitive), *from*, which does not contribute to the general effect of this inexhaustible saying: *with* is related to the idea of sight, as *from* is to that of hearing. If Jesus mentions on His own part *speaking* (*λαλεῖν*) and on the part of the Jews *doing*,

(ποιεῖν), it is because His activity consisted essentially, at this moment, in His testimonies and His judgments, while the Jews answered Him by hostile measures and projects of murder (ver. 37). If it were desired, with *Hengstenberg*, to give to ποιεῖτε, *you do*, the sense of the imperative *do*, it would not be necessary to see here a summons of the character of that in chap. xiii. 27; it would rather be necessary to refer the word *your father* to God, and to see in the word a serious exhortation. But all this is opposed to the connection with what follows.

Vv. 39—41a. “*They answered and said to him, Our father is Abraham. Jesus said to them, If you were<sup>1</sup> Abraham’s children, you would do<sup>2</sup> the works of Abraham. 40. But now you seek to kill me, a man who has told you the truth which I have heard from God; Abraham did not do this. 41 a. You do the works of your father.*” The Jews feel themselves insulted by the insinuation of ver. 38; they affirm more energetically, and with a feeling of wounded dignity, their descent from Abraham. Jesus takes up again His answer in ver. 37 and develops it. In this domain, He says, there is no real paternal relationship where there is opposition in conduct. The Alexandrian reading: *If you are . . . you would do*, can be defended only by supposing a decided grammatical anomaly. John would at first lay down the fact as real (*you are*), to deny it afterwards in the second clause (*you would do*). In any case this explanation is preferable to that of *Origen* and *Augustine*, to which *Weiss* inclines, accepting the reading of B, “*If you are . . . do then!*” But Jesus is not exhorting, He is proving. This Alexandrian reading seems to be the result of an arbitrary correction. The verb of the principal clause ἐποιεῖτε ἂν, *you would do*, was first changed into the imperative ποιεῖτε, *do*, and after this it was necessary to transform the ἦτε (*if you were*) into ἔστε (*if you are*). Abraham was distinguished for an absolute docility to the divine truth (Gen. xii., xxii.), and by a respectful love for those who were the organs of it in his presence (Gen. xvi., xviii.); what a contrast to the conduct of his descendants according to the flesh! Observe the gradation (ver. 40): 1. To kill a man; 2. A man who is an organ of the truth; 3. Of the truth which comes from God. Their moral descent from Abraham being thus set aside, the result is this: “*You have therefore another father, the one whose will you do and whose works you practice, as I do those of my Father.*”

Vv. 41b—43. “*They said therefore<sup>3</sup> to him: We are not children born<sup>4</sup> in fornication; we have only one father, God. 42. Jesus said<sup>5</sup> unto them, If God were your Father, you would love me; for I came forth and am come from God; for neither am I come of myself, but he sent me. 43. Why do you not recognize my speech? Because you cannot understand my word.*”

<sup>1</sup> Instead of ἦτε (*if you were*) which is read by T. R. with 14 Mj. and nearly all the other authorities, Mm. Vss. Orig. (3 times), εστε (*if you are*) is read in  $\aleph$  B D L T Orig. (10 times).

<sup>2</sup> All the MSS., even those which read εστε, have ποιεῖτε (*you would do*), except B which, with Orig. (10 times) reads ποιεῖτε (*do*); Vulg.

*Augustine: facite.*—ἂν is omitted by 11 Mj 80 Mm. Orig. (12 times).

<sup>3</sup>  $\aleph$  B L T Italicque Syr. reject οὐν.

<sup>4</sup> B D: οὐκ ἐγεννηθήμεν instead of οὐ γεγεννημεθα.

<sup>5</sup> The οὐν of T. R. has in its favor only 7 Mj. ( $\aleph$  D M etc.).

The Jews now accept the moral sense in which Jesus takes the notion of sonship and use it in their own behalf: "Let us not speak any more of Abraham, if thou wilt have it so; whatever it may be, in the spiritual domain, of which it seems that thou art thinking, it is God alone who is our Father. And we have been able to receive in His house only good examples and good principles." *We, ἡμεῖς*, at the beginning of the clause; persons such as we are! From the time of the return from the captivity (comp. the books of Nehemiah and Malachi), the union with a Gentile woman was regarded as impure, and the child born of such a marriage as illegitimate, as belonging through one of its parents to the family of Satan, the God of the heathen. It is probably in this sense that the Jews say: "We have only one Father, God." They were born in the most normal theocratic conditions; they have not a drop of idolatrous blood in their veins; they are *Hebrews, born of Hebrews* (Phil. iii. 5). Thus, even when rising with Jesus to the moral point of view, they cannot rid themselves altogether of their idea of physical sonship. *Meyer, Ewald* and *Weiss* think that they mean that their common mother, Sarah, was not a woman guilty of adultery. But how could a supposition like this come to their thought! *Lücke* and *de Wette* suppose rather that they assert the fact that their worship is free from any idolatrous element. But the question here is of origin, not of worship. It would be possible, according to the sense which we have given, that they were alluding to the Samaritans born of a mingling of Jewish and heathen populations.

But Jesus does not hesitate to deprive them even of this higher prerogative, which they think they can ascribe to themselves with so much of assurance. And He does this by the same method which He has just employed, in ver. 40, to deny their patriarchal filiation: He lays down a moral fact against which their claim is shattered. By virtue of His origin, of which He is distinctly conscious (ver. 14), Jesus knows that His appearing carries with it a divine seal. Every true child of God will be disposed to love Him. Their ill-will towards Him is, consequently, enough to annihilate their claim to the title of children of God. The true translation of the words: ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον καὶ ἦκω, is: "It is from God that I came forth and *am here*," (ἦκω, present formed from a perfect). Jesus presents Himself to the world with the consciousness that nothing in Him weakens the impression which the heavenly abode that He has just left must make upon accessible souls. Ἐξῆλθον, *I came forth*, refers to the divine fact of the incarnation; ἦκω, *I am here*, to the divine character of His appearing. And along with His origin and His presence, there is also *His mission* which He has from God: "For neither am I *come of myself*." This second point is fitted to confirm the impression produced by the first ones. He does not accomplish here below a work of His own choice; He continues in the service of that work which God gives to Him at each moment (*for . . . neither*). If they loved God, they would without difficulty recognize this character of His coming, His person and His work.

Ver. 43. Why then does all this escape them? How does it happen, in

particular, that they do not distinguish the tone, and, so to speak, the heavenly *timbre* of his *speech*? *Λαλία*, speech, differs from *λόγος*, word, as the form differs from the contents, the discourse from the doctrine. "You do not know my *speech*; you do not distinguish it from an ordinary human word. Why? Because you are unable to lay hold of and receive *my doctrine*." There was wanting to them that internal organ by means of which the teaching of Christ would become in them a light perceived. *Ἀκοίειν*, to hear, signifies here to *understand*; to listen with that calmness, that seriousness, that good will which enables one to apprehend. This inability was not a fact of creation; it results from their previous moral life; compare v. 44-47. Jesus now develops in full the idea of the first cause of their moral incapacity. This cause He had already declared in ver. 38. It is the dependence in which they are inwardly on an enemy of the truth, who fills their hearts with tumultuous and hateful passions, and thus renders them deaf to the voice of God which speaks to them through Jesus.

Ver. 44. "You are born of the<sup>1</sup> father, the devil, and you wish to fulfil the desires of your father. He was a murderer from the beginning, and he is not in the truth, because there is no truth in him; when he speaks falsehood, he speaks of his own, for he is a liar and<sup>2</sup> the father of the liar." The light does not succeed in penetrating into this Jewish medium, because it is subjected to a principle of darkness. *ὑμεῖς*, you, is strongly emphasized: "You who boast of having God as your Father." *Grotius* made τοῦ διαβόλου, of the devil, the object of πατρός, taking the former word in a collective sense: the father of the demons. *Hilgenfeld*, starting from the same grammatical construction, surprises the evangelist here in the very act of Gnosticism. This *father of the devil*, according to this critic, is the Demiurge of the Gnostics; in other words, the creator of this material world, the God of the Jews, who is designated here as the father of Satan, in accordance with the doctrine of the Ophites in *Irenæus*.<sup>3</sup> Jesus would thus say to the Jews, not: "You are the sons of the devil," but: "You are the sons of the father of the devil;" that is to say, the *brothers* of the latter. But where can we find in the Scriptures a word respecting the person of the devil's father? And how, on the supposition that this father of the devil was the God of the Jews, could Jesus have called this God of the Jews His own Father ("the house of *my Father*" ii. 16)? Finally, it is sufficient to compare 1 John iii. 10, in order to understand that He calls the Jews not the *brothers*, but the *sons* of the devil. The literal meaning is the following: You are sons of the *father* who is the *devil*, and not, as you think, of that other father who is God."

The lawless passions (*ἐπιθυμίαι*) by which this father is animated and which he communicates to them, are unfolded in the second part of the verse: they are, first, hatred of man, and then, abhorrence of truth; pre-

<sup>1</sup> T. R. omits, with some Mss. only, του (the) before πατρός.

<sup>2</sup> Instead of καί, ἰσθῆ and some Fathers read καθως και (as also).

<sup>3</sup> Hilgenfeld: "The Ophites regarded *Jaldabaoth* (the Creator of the world and the God of the Jews) as the *father of the serpent* (*Eint.*, p. 725).

cisely the tendencies with which Jesus had just reproached the Jews, ver. 40. The verb *θέλετε*, *you desire, you are eager for* (v. 35), is contrary to the fatalistic principle which *Hilgenfeld* attributes to John; it expresses the voluntary assent, the abounding sympathy with which they set themselves to the work of realizing the aspirations of their father. The first of these diabolical appetites is the thirst for human blood. Some interpreters ancient and modern (*Cyril, Nitzsch, Lücke, de Wette, Reuss*) explain the word *ἀνθρωποκτόνος*, *murderer*, by an allusion to the murder of Abel. Comp. 1 John iii. 12, 15: “*Not as Cain, who was of the evil one and slew his brother. . . . Whosoever hates his brother is a murderer.*” But the Scriptures do not ascribe to the demon a part in this crime, and the relation which Jesus establishes here between the murderous hatred of Satan and his character as a liar, leads us rather to refer the word *murderer* to the seduction in Paradise by which Satan caused man to fall under the yoke of sin and thereby of death. By thus separating him from God, through falsehood, he has devoted him to spiritual and physical ruin. The expression *from the beginning* may, on this view, be much more strictly explained. The sense of *ἀρχή*, *beginning*, does not differ from that of this word in i. 1, except that here the question is of the beginning of the human race, there of the beginning of creation. As to the quotation taken from 1 John, it proves nothing in favor of the allusion to the act of Cain; for that act is there cited as the first example of the hatred of *a man* to his brother. When Jesus said in ver. 40: “*You seek to kill me, a man,*” He already had in His mind the idea of that murderous hatred which is expressed by the word *ἀνθρωποκτόνος*. Whence did this hatred of Satan against man arise? Undoubtedly, from the fact that he had discerned in him the future organ of divine truth and the destroyer of his own lies. Thus the two features of his character are united: hatred of man and enmity to the truth. And we may understand, how this double hatred must be concentrated in the highest degree upon Jesus, in whom at length was perfectly realized the idea of man and of man as the organ of divine truth. Some interpreters, ancient and modern, have applied the expression *ἐν ἀληθείᾳ οὐχ ἔστηκεν* to the fall of the devil. *Vulgate*: *in veritate non stetit*; *Arnauld*: *he did not abide in the truth*; *Osterwald*: *he did not persist in . . .* But the perfect *ἔστηκα* does not mean: *did not abide in*; its sense, in the sacred as in the classic Greek, is: “*I have placed myself in a position and I am there.*” Jesus therefore does not mean to say that the devil has abandoned the domain of truth, in which he was originally placed by God, but rather that he does not find himself there, or, more exactly, that he has not taken his place there, and consequently is not there.<sup>1</sup> The domain of *truth* is that of the real essence of things, clearly recognized and affirmed, holiness. And why does he not live in this domain? *Because*, Jesus adds, *there is no truth in him.* He is

<sup>1</sup> *Westcott* explains the form *οὐκ* instead of *οὐχ* before *ἔστηκεν*, in *Ⲛ B D L X* etc., by making this verb the imperfect of *στήκω* (*ἔστηκεν*); comp. Rom. xiv. 1 and elsewhere.

He thinks that the context requires a past tense; I do not think so; the question is as to what the devil is and does now, and not of a revelation respecting his beginning.

wanting in inward *truth*, truth in the subjective sense, that uprightness of will which aspires after divine reality. We must observe, in this last clause, the absence of the article before the word ἀληθεία, *truth*: Satan is cut off from *the truth*, because he is destitute of *truth*. One can abide in *the truth* (objectively speaking) in that which God reveals, only when one sincerely desires it. The ὅτι, *because*, is the counterpart of that in ver. 43. Like father, like son: each of the two lives and works in what is false, because he *is* false.

What Jesus has just set forth in a negative form, He reproduces in a positive form in the second part of the verse. Not desiring to derive anything from divine truth, Satan is compelled to draw everything that he says from his own resources, that is from the nothingness of his own subjectivity; for the creature, separated from God, is incapable of possessing and creating anything real. Lying is, in this condition, his natural language, as much as speaking the truth is the natural language of Jesus (ver. 38) in the communion with God in which He lives. Ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων, *from his own resources*, admirably characterizes the creative faculty of a being separated from God, who is capable no doubt of producing something, even sometimes great works, and of uttering great words, but whose creations, in proportion as he creates apart from God, are always only a vain phantasmagoria. The word ψεύστης, a liar, reproduces the idea: *He has no truth in him*. In the expression: "He is a liar and *also his father*," we must not make the word *his father* a second subject to *is*, as if the question were here also of the father of the devil (*Hilgenfeld*). The word: *and his father* is the predicate: "he is a liar and father of . . ." Otherwise ὅτι αὐτὸς ψεύστης ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ would have been necessary. Only it may be asked to what substantive it is necessary to refer the pronoun αὐτοῦ (*his*); to the word ψεύστης, *liar*, or the word ψευδοῦς, *falsehood*, in the preceding clause? I think, with *Lücke*, *Meyer* and others, that the context is decisive in favor of the first alternative. For the question here is, not of the origin of falsehood in general, but specially of the moral sonship of the individual *liars* whom Jesus has before Him (vv. 40, 44).<sup>1</sup> *Weiss* objects that in the expression: "he is a liar," the word *liar* is used in the generic sense. It is true; but we may certainly derive from it the notion of a concrete substantive. In both senses, there is a slight grammatical difficulty to be overcome. The theory of accommodation, by means of which it is often sought to weaken the force of the declarations of Jesus respecting the personal existence of Satan, may have some probability when it is applied to His conversations with the demoniacs. But here Jesus gives altogether

<sup>1</sup> The reading καθὼς καὶ (*as also his father*) in the Itala and in some Fathers, is a correction due to the Gnostics who desired, like *Hilgenfeld*, to find here the mention of the *father of the devil*. The Fathers, however, adopted this reading only on condition of reading before it ὡς ἂν (*he who*) instead of ὅταν (*when, each time when*); this is the translation which *Westcott* thinks may be given when following

the ordinary reading, though at the same time acknowledging the harshness of the ellipsis of the subject of λαλή (any man whatsoever): "Whoever says what is false, speaks of his own; for he is a liar, *as also his father, the devil*." Respecting the explanation of *Hilgenfeld*, who finds here again the indication of the father of the devil, see *Introd.*, Vol. I., p. 130 f.

spontaneously this teaching with respect to the person, the character and the part of this mysterious being.<sup>1</sup> After this Jesus comes back from the father to the children: they are enemies of the truth, just as the evil being is to whom they are subject:

Vv. 45-47. "And because I say the truth to you, you believe me not. 46. Which of you can convict me of sin? And if<sup>2</sup> I say the truth, why do you not believe me?<sup>3</sup> 47. He that is of God hears the words of God; for this cause you hear them not, because you are not of God." What, ordinarily, causes a man to be believed is the fact that he speaks the truth. Jesus has with the Jews the opposite experience. They are so swayed by falsehood, by which their father has blinded their hearts, that precisely because he speaks the truth, he does not find credence with them. Ἐγώ, at the beginning: I, the organ of the truth, in opposition to Satan, the organ of falsehood.

Ver. 46. To justify their distrust with respect to His *words*, it would be necessary that they should at least be able to accuse Him of some fault in His *actions*; for holiness and truth are sisters. Can they do this? Let them do it. This defiance which Jesus hurls at His adversaries shows that He feels Himself fully cleared, by His defense in chap. vii., of the crime of which He had been accused in chap. v. We must be careful, indeed, not to take ἀμαρτία, *sin*, in the sense of *error* (Calvin, Melancthon) or of *falsehood* (Fritzsche). The thought is the same here as in vii. 18: Jesus affirms that there absolutely does not arise from His *moral conduct* any ground of suspicion against the truth of His teaching. We must imagine this question as followed by a pause sufficient to give opportunity to whoever should wish to accuse Him to be heard. . . . No one opens his mouth. The admission involved in this silence serves as a premise for the following argument: "Well, then, if (εἰ δέ, *now if*, or simply εἰ), as your silence proves, I teach the truth, why do you not believe?" Here

<sup>1</sup> If St. Augustine, and following his example the Catholic interpreters and some modern writers, have been wrong in seeing in the expression οὐχ ἔσθηκεν the indication of the *fall* of the devil, Frommann and Reuss are no less in error in finding in our passage the idea of an *eternal* principle of evil. The term ἔσθηκεν expresses, as Meyer says, the *actual fact*: "This passage declares the bad moral situation of the devil, as it is, without teaching anything as to the origin of this state . . ." "But," he adds, "the fall of the devil is necessarily implied by this saying." I think that it is even necessary to go a step farther. The perfect ἔσθηκα, while designating the *present state* implies the notion of a *past act* to which this state is due; not in this case, if I mistake not, the idea of a fall *out* of truth already known, but that of a refusal to enter into revealed truth, to the end of becoming firmly established therein and of yielding submission to it. Every free being is called, at some moment in his existence, to sacrifice

voluntarily his natural autonomy, and to subordinate his *ego* to the manifestation of good, to the *unveiled truth*, that is, to God who reveals himself. Herein is the decisive test for him, from which neither angel nor man escapes. The refusal of this voluntary annulling of oneself in the presence of the revelation of the good, of the perfect good, of God,—this is *evil* in its first form (simply negative). The exaggerated affirmation of the *ego*, positive evil, is its immediate result. This refusal to abdicate before the truth, to go out of oneself and to ingraft oneself in God—herein is the fall both of the devil and the man; it cannot be better formulated than in these terms: "not to be in the truth, because one has *not placed* himself there at the required moment, that of its revelation."

<sup>2</sup>T. R.: εἰ δέ with 11 Mj.; εἰ simply in B C L X Π 20 Mnn. It. Vulg. Syr. Cop.

<sup>3</sup>D omits the 46th verse (confounding of the two οὐ πιστεύετε μοι).

again a pause; He had invited them to judge Him; in the face of His innocence which has just been established, He leaves them a moment now to pass judgment on their conduct towards Him. After this silence, He pronounces the sentence: "You are not of God: herein is the true reason of your unbelief towards me." The expression *to be of God* designates the state of a soul which has placed itself, and which now is, under the influence of divine action. It is the opposite of the *οὐχ ἐστῆκεν* affirmed with regard to Satan. This state does not exclude, but implies, the free determination of the man. Otherwise, the tone of reproach which prevails in our verse would be unjust and even absurd. Ἀκούειν, properly, *to hear*, takes here, as often the French term does, the sense of *intelligent hearing* (hence the limiting word in the accusative). Comp. the manner in which the declaration of Jesus respecting the truth which gives freedom (ver. 32) had been received. The *διὰ τοῦτο*, *for this cause*, refers at once to the general principle laid down in the first part of the verse, and the following *ὅτι*: "It is for this cause . . . , that is to say, because . . ."

The *perfect* holiness of Christ is proved in this passage, not by the silence of the Jews, who might very well have ignored the sins of their interlocutor, but by the assurance with which Jesus lays this question before them. Without the immediate consciousness which Christ had of the perfect purity of His life, and on the supposition that He was only a more holy man than other men, a moral sense so delicate as that which such a state would imply, would not have suffered the least stain to pass unnoticed, either in His life, or in His heart; and what hypocrisy would there not have been in this case in addressing to others a question with the aim of causing them to give it a different answer from that which, in His inmost heart, He gave Himself! In other terms: to give a false proof whose want of soundness He hopes that no one will be able to prove.

Conclusion: vv. 48-50.

Vv. 48-50. "*The Jews therefore*<sup>1</sup> *answered and said to him, Say we not rightly that thou art a Samaritan and art possessed by a demon?* 49. *Jesus answered: I am not possessed by a demon, but I honor my Father, and you dishonor me.* 50. *But I seek not my own glory; there is one who seeks it and who judges.*" Some, as Hengstenberg and Astié, think that by calling Jesus a Samaritan, they wish to charge Him with *heresy*, as making Himself equal with God. But the term Samaritan can scarcely be regarded as a synonym of blasphemer. The Samaritans passed for national enemies of the Jews; now Jesus seemed to commit an act of hostility against His people by accusing all the Jews of being children of the devil. The madness of insanity, as it seemed to them, could alone give an explanation of such language; and this is what they express by the words: *Thou art possessed of a demon*, which are, as it were, the counterpart of the charge of Jesus. The meaning of this assault comes to this: Thou art as wicked as thou art foolish.

"Who when he was reviled," says St. Peter, "*reviled not again, but commit-*

ted himself to him who judges righteously" (1 Pet. ii. 23). These words seem to have been suggested to the apostle by the recollection of the following reply in our verses 49, 50. To the insult, Jesus opposes a simple denial. Ἐγώ, I, placed first, is pronounced with the profound feeling of the contrast between the character of His person and the manner in which He is treated. To the false explanation which the Jews give of His preceding discourse, Jesus substitutes the true one: "I do not speak of you as I do, under the impulse of hatred; but I speak thus to honor my Father. The testimony which I bear against you is a homage which I must pay to the divine holiness. But, instead of bowing the head to the voice of Him who tells you the truth from God, you insult Him—Him who glorifies the one whom you claim to be your Father." The conclusion is this: You cannot be children of God, since you insult me who speak to you only to honor God!

Nevertheless (ver. 50), Jesus declares that the affronts with which they loaded Him were to Him of little importance. It is God who looks to this; He commits to God the care of His glory; for He knows His solicitude for Him. He wishes to be honored only in the measure in which His Father Himself gives Him glory in the hearts of men. The two participles: *seeking* and *judging* give a presentiment of the divine acts by which the Father will glorify the Son and will chastise His calumniators: on one side, the sending of the Holy Spirit and the founding of the new Israel; on the other, the fall of Jerusalem and the final judgment. It is thus that "he commits himself to him who judges righteously." Besides, all do not dishonor Him; there are some who already honor Him by their faith:

2. The last testimonies of Jesus respecting His person: vv. 51-59.

Vv. 51-53. "*Verily, verily, I say unto you, If any one keep my word, he shall never see death.* 52. *The Jews therefore<sup>1</sup> said to him, Now we know that thou art possessed of a demon; Abraham is dead and the prophets also, and thou sayest, If any one keep my word, he shall never taste of death.*<sup>2</sup> 53. *Art thou greater than our father Abraham, who is dead? And the prophets also are dead. Whom dost thou<sup>3</sup> pretend to be?*" The various relations of ideas which it has been sought to establish between ver. 50 and ver. 51 seem to me hardly natural. With the last word of ver. 50: *and who judges*, Jesus has come to an end with His present interlocutors. But He knows that among these numerous hearers who had believed in Him (ver. 30) and of whom many had immediately succumbed to the test (ver. 32), there are a certain number who have fulfilled the condition imposed by Him (ver. 31): *If you abide in my word*; it is to these, as it seems to me, as well as to His disciples in general, that He addresses the glorious promise of ver. 51. So *Calvin, de Wette*, etc., think. *Weiss* holds that the discourse simply continues: Jesus shows that His word will be the means through which God will glorify Him, by giving life to some and judging others by

<sup>1</sup> N B C omit οὐν.

γενησθαι.

<sup>2</sup> B reads θανατον ου μη θεωρηση (as in ver. 51). T. R., γενεται with EF H. All the rest

<sup>3</sup> Σου is rejected by 10 Mj. (N A B C, etc.), 50 Mm. It. Vulg. Syr. Cop. Orig.

means of it,—which will show to all that He is the Messiah. The expression: *keep my word*, as well as the tone of the promise, carries us back to the exhortation of ver. 31: *Abide in my word*; and the promise of never seeing death is the opposite of the threatening of ver. 35: *The slave does not abide in the house for ever*. The term *death* is not taken in the exclusively spiritual sense, as if Jesus meant: *shall not be condemned*. Would there not be some charlatanism on Jesus' part in giving Himself the appearance of saying more than He really meant? It is indeed *death*, death itself, in the full sense of the word, which He denies for the believer. See at vi. 50 and xiv. 3. What an encouragement presented to those who persevered in His word: no longer to have to experience death in death!

The Jews do not altogether misapprehend therefore, as is claimed, when they conclude from these words that Jesus promises to believers a privilege which was enjoyed neither by Abraham nor by the prophets, and that He makes Himself greater than these; for it is manifest that He must Himself possess the prerogative which He promises to His own. The expression: *taste of death*, rests upon the comparison of death with a bitter cup which a man is condemned to drink. The word *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, *for ever*, in vv. 51, 52, should not be explained in the sense: "He will die indeed, but not *for ever*." The sense is: "He shall never perform the act of dying." Comp. xiii. 8. The pronoun *ὅστις*, instead of the simple *ὅς*, signifies: "who, Abraham though he was." This objection forces Jesus to rise to the highest affirmation which He has uttered with reference to Himself, that of His divine pre-existence.

If Jesus is the conqueror of death for His own, it is because He Himself belongs to *the eternal order*. He comes from a sphere in which there is no transition from nothingness to existence, and consequently no more falling from existence into death, except in the case in which He Himself consented to give Himself up to its power.

Vv. 54-56. "*Jesus answered, If I glorify<sup>1</sup> myself, my glory is nothing; he who glorifies me is my Father, he of whom you say that he is your<sup>2</sup> God; 55 and yet you do not know him, but I know him; and if I say that I do not know him, I shall be like to you<sup>3</sup> a liar; but I know him and I keep his word. 56. Abraham, your father, rejoiced in the hope of seeing my day; and he saw it, and was glad.*" In one sense, Jesus glorifies Himself, indeed, whenever He gives testimony to Himself; but the emphasis is on *ἐγώ, I*, "I alone, without the Father, seeking and attributing to myself a position which has not been given to me." The word *δοξάσω* may be either the future indicative or the aorist subjunctive. Here is the answer to the question: *Whom dost thou claim to be?* "Nothing except that which the Father has willed that I should be." And this will of the Father with regard to Him is continually manifested by striking signs which the Jews would

<sup>1</sup> Instead of *δοξάσω*, which is read by T. R. with 12 Mj. and the Mnn., *δοξασω* is read in **N B C D** It<sup>al</sup> Orig.

<sup>2</sup> Instead of *υμῶν* which is read by T. R. with **N B D F X** most of the Mnn. It<sup>al</sup> Hierique,

*ημῶν* (*our*) is read in the 12 other Mj. Mnn. Syr.

<sup>3</sup> Instead of *υμῶν* which T. R. reads with A B D, the rest read *υμῶν*.

easily discern, if God were to them really what they claim that He is: *their* God. But they do not know Him; and therefore they do not understand the signs by which He whom they declare to be their God accredits Him before their eyes.

This ignorance of God which Jesus encounters in the Jews awakens in Him, by the law of contrast, the feeling of the real knowledge which He has of the Father, in whose name and honor He speaks: He affirms this prerogative with a triumphant energy, in ver. 55. It is, as it were, the paroxysm of faith which Jesus has in Himself, a faith founded on the certainty of that immediate consciousness which He has of God. If He did not assert Himself thus as knowing God, He would be also a liar like them, when they claim to know Him. And the proof that He does not lie is His obedience, which stands in contrast with their disobedience. Thus are the unheard of affirmations prepared for, which are to follow in vv. 56, 58. *οἶδα, I know him*, designates direct, intuitive knowledge, in opposition to *ἐγνώκατε* (literally, *you have learned to know*), which relates to an acquired knowledge.

After having thus answered the reproach: *Thou glorifiest thyself*, Jesus comes to the question raised by them: *Art thou greater than our father Abraham?* and He does not hesitate to answer plainly: "Yes! I am, for after having been the object of his hope when he was on earth, my coming was that of his joy in Paradise where he now is!" There is a keen irony in this apposition: "Abraham, *your* father." Their spiritual patron rejoicing in the expectation of an appearance which excites only their spite! The word *rejoiced* designates the joy of hope, as is indicated by the *ἴνα ἴδῃ, to the end of seeing. To see Him*—this was the aim and object of the exultant joy of the patriarch. The question is evidently of what took place in Abraham's heart, when he received from the mouth of God the Messianic promises, such as Gen. xii. 3 and xxii. 18: "*In thy seed shall all the nations be blessed, because thou hast obeyed my voice.*" The expression *my day* can only designate the present time, that of Christ's appearance on earth (Luke xvii. 22). The explanations of *Chrysostom* (the day of the Passion) and *Bengel* (the day of the Parousia) are not at all justified here. *Hofmann* and *Luthardt* understand by it the *promised* birth of Isaac, a promise in which Abraham saw the pledge of that of the Messiah. But the expression: *my day*, can only refer to a fact concerning the person of Christ Himself.

The relation between the *ἴνα ἴδῃ, to see*, and the past *εἶδε, and he saw*, proves that this last term expresses the realization of the desire which had caused the patriarch to rejoice, the appearance of Jesus here below. The second aorist passive, *εἶχάρην*, well expresses the calm joy of the sight, in contrast with the exultant joy of the expectation (*ἠγαλλίασατο*). Jesus therefore reveals here, as most of the interpreters acknowledge, a fact of the invisible world, of which He alone could have knowledge. As at the transfiguration we see Moses and Elijah acquainted with the circumstances of the earthly life of Jesus, so Jesus declares that Abraham, the father of believers, is not a stranger, in his abode of glory, to the fulfill-

ment of the promises which had been made to Him,—that he beheld the coming of the Messiah on the earth. No doubt we know not in what form the events of this world can be rendered sensible to those who live in the bosom of God. Jesus simply affirms the fact. This interpretation is the only one which leaves to the words their natural meaning. The Fathers apply the *eide*, *we saw*, to certain typical events in the course of the life of Abraham, such as the birth or the sacrifice of Isaac, in which the patriarch, by anticipation, beheld the fulfillment of the promises. These explanations are excluded by the marked opposition which the text establishes between the joy of the *expectation* and that of the *actual sight*. The same is true of that of *Hengstenberg* and *Keil*, who apply the last words of the verse to the visit of the angel of the Lord as Logos-Jesus (Gen. xviii.). The expression *my day* can receive, in all these applications, only a forced meaning. The Socinian explanation: "Abraham would have exulted, if he had seen my day," is no longer cited except as calling it to mind. What can be made of the second clause with this interpretation?

By bringing out this two-fold joy of Abraham, that of the promise and that of the fulfillment, Jesus puts the Jews to the blush at the contrast between their feelings and those of their alleged father.

Vv. 57, 58. "*Whereupon the Jews said to him, Thou art not yet fifty<sup>1</sup> years old, and thou hast seen Abraham!*"<sup>2</sup> 58. *Jesus said to them, Verily, verily I say unto you, Before Abraham came into being,<sup>3</sup> I am.*" From the fact that Abraham had seen Jesus, it seemed to follow that Jesus must have seen Abraham. The question of the Jews is the expression of indignant surprise. The number fifty is a round number; *fifty years* designates the close of the age of manhood. The meaning is: "Thou art not yet an old man." No inference is to be drawn from this as to the real age of Jesus, since ten or twenty years more, in this case, would be of no consequence. "I am not only his contemporary," Jesus replies, "but I existed even before him." The formula, *amen, amen*, announces the greatness of this revelation respecting His person. By the terms *γενέσθαι*, *became*, and *εἰμί*, *I am*, Jesus, as *Weiss* says, contrasts His eternal existence with the historical beginning of the existence of Abraham. *To become* is to pass from nothingness to existence; *I am* designates a mode of existence which is not due to such a transition. Jesus goes still further; He says, not *I was*, but *I am*. Thereby He attributes to Himself, not a simple priority as related to Abraham, which would still be compatible with the Arian view of the Person of Christ, but existence in the absolute, eternal, Divine order. This expression recalls that of Ps. xc. 2: "*Before the mountains were brought forth and thou hadst founded the earth, from eternity to eternity, THOU ART, O God!*" No doubt, eternity must not be considered as strictly *anterior* to time. This term *πρὶν*, *before*, is a symbolic form, derived from the human consciousness of Jesus, to express the relation of *dependence* of time on

<sup>1</sup> Δ 3 Mnn. Chrys.: τεσσαρακοντα (forty).      seen thee).

<sup>2</sup> Σ: και Αβρ. εωρακεν σε (and Abraham hath

<sup>3</sup> D It<sup>all</sup> omit γενεσθαι (became).

eternity in the only way in which the mind of man can conceive of it, that is, under the form of succession. There is no longer any thought, at the present day, of having recourse to the forced explanations which were formerly proposed by different commentators: that of *Socinus* and *Paulus*: "I am, as the *Messiah* promised, anterior to Abraham," or that of the Socinian catechism: Before Abraham could justify His name of Abraham (*father of a multitude*, by reason of the multitude of heathen who shall one day be converted) I am *your Messiah*, for you Jews. *Scholten* himself acknowledges (p. 97 f.) the insufficiency of these exegetical attempts. According to him, we must supply a predicate of *εἶμι*; this would be *ὁ χριστός*, the *Messiah*. But the antithesis of *εἶμι* and *γίνεσθαι* (*be* and *become*) does not allow us to give to the first of these terms another sense than that of existing. Besides, the point in hand is a reply to the question: "Hast thou then seen Abraham?" The reply, if understood as *Scholten* would have it, would be unsuitable to this question. The Socinian *Crell* and *de Wette* understand: "I exist in the divine intelligence or plan." *Beyschlag* goes a little farther still. According to him, Jesus means that there is realized in Himself here below an eternal, divine, but impersonal principle, the image of God. But as this impersonal image of God cannot exist except in the divine intelligence, this comes back in reality to the explanation of *de Wette*. This explanation of an impersonal ideal is opposed by three considerations: 1. The *ἐγώ*, *I*, which proves that this eternal being is personal; 2, the parallel with Abraham. An impersonal principle cannot be placed in parallelism with a person, especially when the question is of a relation of priority. Finally, 3. How could a Jesus conceived of as an impersonal principle have answered the objection of the Jews: *Thou hast then seen Abraham?* And yet if this word did not satisfy the demand of the Jews, it would be nothing more than a ridiculous boast.<sup>1</sup> This declaration has the character of the most elevated solemnity. It is certainly one of those from which John derived the fundamental idea of the first verses of the Prologue. It bears in itself the guaranty of its authenticity, first by its striking conciseness, and then by its very meaning. What historian would gratuitously ascribe to his hero a saying which was fitted to bring upon him the charge of being mad? It will be asked, no doubt, how Jesus can derive from His human consciousness an expression which so absolutely transcends it. This conception was derived by Him from the revelation of His Father, when He said to Him: "Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." There is a fact here which is analogous to that which is accomplished in the conscience of the believer when he through the Spirit receives the testimony that he is *a child of God* (Rom. viii. 16).

<sup>1</sup> *Beyschlag* himself has felt this; he now has recourse to another expedient, the one which *Weizsäcker* proposed: the distinction between the two theologies placed in juxtaposition in our Gospel; that of Jesus Himself and that of the evangelist (to which alone the

idea of pre-existence belongs). But it is not easy to understand how from this point of view the authenticity of the Gospel can still be defended, as it is defended by *Beyschlag* (comp. on this question *Introd.*, vol. I., p. 123).

Vv. 59. "Thereupon, they took up stones to stone him; but Jesus hid himself and went out of the temple."<sup>1</sup> In the face of this reply, there was indeed nothing left to the Jews except to worship—or to stone him. The word ἔκρυβεν, strictly: they lifted up, indicates a volition, a menace, still more, perhaps than a well-settled purpose. Comp. the stronger expression in x. 31. These stones were probably lying in the court, for the building of the temple, which was not yet finished. The word ἐκρύβην, hid himself, does not include, but rather excludes the idea of a miracle. Jesus was surrounded by a circle of disciples and friends who facilitated His escape. Whatever may be the authority of the documents and Versions which support the T. R. here (see the note), it is evident that the last words are a marginal gloss formed by means of the first words of the following chapter and of Luke iv. 30. Baur defends their authenticity, and tries to draw from them a proof of the Docetism of the author. But the normal expression, from the Docetic point of view, would have been, not ἐκρύβην (*he hid himself*), but ἄφαντος or ἀφανής ἐγένετο (*he vanished*).

Here is the end of the most violent conflict which Jesus had had to sustain in Judea. Chaps. vii. and viii. correspond in this regard with chap. vi. The general victory of unbelief is here decided for Judea, as it had been in chap. vi. for Galilee. So from this time Jesus gradually abandons the field of battle to His adversaries, until that other final ἐκρύβην, xii. 36, which will close His public ministry in Israel.

We have seen all the improbabilities, which criticism has found in such large numbers in this chapter and the preceding one, vanish before a calm and conscientious exegesis. The answers and objections of the Jews, which *Reuss* charges with being grotesque and absurd, have appeared to us, when placing ourselves at the point of view of those who make them, natural and logical. The argument of Jesus which, according to *Renan*, "is very weak when judged by the rules of Aristotelian logic," appears so only because it is forgotten that the question is of things which Jesus, counting on the moral consciousness of His adversaries, thought He might lay down as axioms. There is certainly, in the narrative of these two chapters, vii. and viii., not a single improbability which approaches that which there would be in supposing such conversations invented afterwards outside of the historical situation to which they so perfectly adapt themselves. There is no verbiage, no incongruity, no break of continuity. This reproduction of the conversations of Jesus is made with such delicacy, that one almost gives his assent to the hypothesis of a rationalist of the past century, *Bertholdt*, who supposed that the evangelist had taken notes of the discourses of Jesus at the very time when he heard them. Two features strike us especially in these two chapters: 1. The *dialogue* form, so full of reality, which could have engraved itself on the mind of a witness more easily than a consecutive discourse; 2. The *summary* character of the testimonies of Jesus. There is always, at the beginning, a simple and grand affirmation without development, vii. 37, 38; viii. 12, 31, 32; then, in

<sup>1</sup> After *ισρου*, T. R. reads διελθων δια μεσον αυτων και παρηγεν ουτως (*passing through the midst of them, and so he departed*), with A C E

F G H K L M S U X Δ A the Mnn. Syr. Cop.; these words are wanting in B D Iptericus Vulg. Sah. Orig. Chrys.

proportion as it becomes the subject of a discussion between Jesus and His hearers, the developments are given. These two features would be sufficient to prove the historical character of the narrative.

## SECOND CYCLE.

## IX. and X.

The consequences of the first point of departure, the healing of the impotent man, chap. v., are exhausted. A new miracle produces a renewed breaking out of hatred among the Jews and calls forth a new phase of the conflict. Nevertheless, one feels that the worst of the conflict is past. The people of Judea, those even who had shown themselves for a moment disposed to believe, are offended, like the Galileans, at the absolute spirituality of the promises of Jesus. He begins from this time to abandon that lost community to its blindness; He labors especially to the end of gathering about Himself the small number of those who are to form the nucleus of the future community. So the incisive character of the preceding conversations gives place to the tone of resignation and of saddened love.

1. Chap. ix. : a new miracle opens the second cycle ;

2. Chap. x. 1-21 : with this miracle is connected a first discourse, and then the representation of its immediate effects ;

3. Chap. x. 22-42 : a second discourse, which, although given a little later and at another visit, is, in respect to its subject, only a continuation of the first ; finally, a brief historical notice.

## FIRST SECTION.

## IX. 1-41.

## THE MIRACLE.

1. The fact : vv. 1-12 ; 2. The investigation : vv. 13-34 ; 3. The moral result : vv. 35-41.

I.—*The fact* : vv. 1-12.

Vv. 1-5. "*And in passing, he saw a man blind from birth ; 2 and his disciples asked him, saying, Master, who did sin, this man or his parents, that he should be born blind ? 3. Jesus answered, Neither did he nor his parents sin ; but that the works of God should be made manifest in him. 4. I must<sup>1</sup> work the works of him who sent<sup>2</sup> me, while it is day ; the night comes, in which no one can work. 5. While I am in the world, I am the light of the world.*" These first five verses describe the situation in which the new miracle is wrought. If the last words of the preceding chapter in the T. R. are authentic, the first words of this would closely connect this scene with the preceding ; comp. *καὶ παράγων* with *παρήγεν οὕτως*. But there

<sup>1</sup> Ⲛ B D L Cop. Orig. read *ἡμας* (*we must do*) favor the 12 other Mj. the Mnn. It. Vulg. Syr. instead of *ἐμε* (*I must do*) which has in its

<sup>2</sup> L. Cop.: *ἡμας* (*us*) instead of *με*.

would be in this case, as *de Wette* has clearly seen, an improbability in the story; for the question which the disciples address to Jesus in ver. 2 implies a more calm condition of mind than that in which they could have been on leaving the temple after the violent scene of chap. viii. Nothing in the authentic text forces us to connect one of these facts with the other. The formula *καὶ παράγων*, and *in passing*, only requires that there should not be placed between them a too considerable interval. If the scene in viii. 30-59 occurred in the morning, that which follows may have taken place in the evening of the same day. This time of the day suits well the figure which the Lord employs (vv. 4, 5). The blind man was sitting at one of the gates either of the temple, or rather of the city, to beg. The disciples learned from him or from others that he was blind from birth. The question which they address to Jesus seems to have been called forth by the marked attention with which he regarded this man (*εἶδεν*). From the point of view of Jewish monotheism, suffering, it seemed, could only be the consequence of sin. But, how apply this law to the present case? The only two alternatives which presented themselves to the mind were those which are indicated by the question of the disciples: but they seemed equally inadmissible. The dogma of the pre-existence of souls or that of metempsychosis might have given some probability to the first supposition; but these systems, although the second especially was not foreign to the Rabbinical teaching, were never popular in Israel. It would therefore have been necessary to hold that the misfortune of this man was an anticipatory chastisement of his future sins, or the punishment of some fault committed by him in the embryonic state (Gen. xxv. 22; Ps. li. 7). But these two explanations must have both appeared very improbable. The other supposition, that this man suffered for the sins of his parents, might be supported by Exod. xx. 5, but nevertheless it seemed contrary to the justice of God. The disciples, perceiving no reasonable solution, ask Jesus to decide the question. The *ὕα* preserves always in some measure the idea of purpose: "*that he should have been born thus, according to the divine plan.*" In His reply, Jesus does not deny the existence of sin in this man or his parents; but no more does He acknowledge the necessity of a moral connection between this individual or family sin and the blindness with which the unhappy man is smitten. He teaches the disciples that they should direct their attention, not to the mysterious cause of the suffering, but to the end for which God permits it and the salutary effects which we can derive from it. Individual suffering is not often connected, except in a *general* way, with the collective sin of humanity (see on v. 14), and does not give us the right to judge the one who suffers. But it always includes a call to fulfill a divine mission towards him by helping him temporally and spiritually. As evil has its work on earth, so God also has His, and it consists in making evil itself an occasion of good. All these acts by which we coöperate in the accomplishment of the divine intention, enter into what Jesus here calls *the works of God*. The sequel will show that this word comprehends in the thought of Jesus, together with the outward act which bears the stamp of the divine

omnipotence (the miracle of healing vv. 6, 7), the spiritual effects which will result from it, the spiritual illumination and the salvation of the blind man (vv. 35-38). The summons to help and save this unhappy man made itself felt in the Lord's heart at the very moment when He had fixed His eyes upon him; hence the *εἶδεν* of ver. 1. The term *φανερώθη*, *be made manifest*, is explained by the fact that these works are originally hidden in the divine plan, before being executed. This point of view from which Jesus regards suffering is that which He seeks to make His disciples share from the end of ver. 3, and that which He develops in vv. 4, 5, by applying it to His own personal task during His sojourn here on earth.

When the master who has entrusted the task to the workman (*ὁ πέμψας*, *he who has sent*), gives the signal, the latter must act as long as the day of working continues. This signal Jesus has just discerned. Though it is a Sabbath, he cannot defer obeying until the morrow. Perhaps Jesus was at that moment beholding on the horizon the sun which was setting and was in a few moments going to disappear. This day which is about to end is for Him the emblem of His earthly life, which is near its termination (viii. 21). "When the night is come," He says, "the workmen cease their work. My work is to enlighten the world, like this sun; and for me, as for it, the task will be ended in a little while. I must not lose a moment, therefore, of the time which remains for me to fulfill it." The reading ("*we must work*") which belongs to the most ancient Mjj, is defended by *Meyer, Lange, Luthardt, Weiss, Westcott, Tischendorf*, etc. In that case, it must be supposed that a substitution for it was made in the numerous documents which read *ἐμέ*, *I*, under the influence of the *με* which follows, as well as that of ver. 5. This is possible; but is it natural that Jesus should apply to all the disciples the duty which He is to fulfill? And is not the contrary supposition also possible? Was there not a desire to make of this altogether individual expression a moral maxim, and still more probably was there not a desire to avoid the application to the Lord of the following words which seemed incompatible with His state of heavenly glory: *The night comes, when no one can work*. It is impossible for me to harmonize the *ἡμᾶς*, *we*, with the *με*, *I*, which follows. For there is a close correlation between the two notions: *to be sent* and *do the work of*. I think therefore that *ἡμᾶς* has been wrongly substituted for *ἐμέ*, and that only two MSS. (8 L) have been consistent throughout in logically adding to the change of *ἐμέ* to *ἡμᾶς* that of *με* to *ἡμᾶς*. The two others (B D), by neglecting to make this second change, have confessed and condemned the first. It is of importance to remark that the ancient Versions, the Itala and Peschito, support the received reading. The contrast of *day* and *night* cannot denote, in this context, that of opportunity and inopportunity, or that of the moment of grace and the hour when it can no longer be obtained; it can be here only the contrast between the time of *working* during the day, and that of *rest* when once the night is come. There is therefore nothing sinister in this figure: *the night*. But in what sense can the idea of *rest* be applied to the heavenly life of Jesus Christ? Does He not continue in heaven, through His Spirit, the work begun

here on earth? True, but, in His heavenly existence, He in reality only reaps that which He sowed during His sojourn on earth (iv. 38). Consequently, a single divine call to do good neglected by Him here below, a single moment lost on earth, would have left an irreparable void in the work of salvation accomplished by the Holy Spirit after His departure. The whole material of the regenerating and sanctifying activity of the Spirit, even to the end of the present dispensation, is derived from the earthly work of Jesus.

The expression: *I am the light of the world*, ver. 5, has no relation to the figure of day and night, ver. 4; it is chosen with reference to the special work which the Lord must now accomplish in giving physical and spiritual light to the one born blind. We see from the conjunction *ὅταν, when*, which can only be rendered by *as long as*, how His sojourn in this world is to the view of Jesus a transitory and in some sort accidental thing. How should He not hasten to employ well a season which must end so soon?

Vv. 6, 7. "*Having said this, he spat on the ground and made clay of the spittle, and he anointed with this clay the eyes of the blind man,<sup>1</sup> 7 and he said to him; Go, wash in the pool of Siloam (a name which means, Sent),<sup>2</sup> He went away therefore and washed, and came seeing.*" By the words: *having said this*, the evangelist presents the following act as the immediate application of the principle which Jesus has just laid down. In Matt. xx. 34 (Mark x. 46), Jesus heals a blind man by a simple touch. In Mark vii. 33; viii. 23, He uses, as here, His saliva for effecting cures. He makes use of an external means, therefore, only in some cases. Hence it follows that He does not use it as a medical agency. Is this the vehicle or the conductor of His miraculous power, as some have thought? The same reason prevents us from deciding for this view. We must rather see in this manner of acting a pedagogic measure, not with the aim of putting the faith of the sick man to the test, as He is about to do with the blind man (*Calvin*), but to the end of entering into more direct and personal contact with him. When Jesus had to do with sick persons who possessed all their senses, He could act upon them with a look or with a word. But in cases like that of the deaf-mute (Mark vii. 33 ff.) and of the blind man (Mark viii. 23) we see Him making use of some material means to put them in relation to His person and to present to their faith its true object. It was necessary that they should know that their cure emanated from *His person*. This knowledge was the starting-point for their faith in Him as the author of their salvation. And if in the case with which we are occupied, Jesus does more than anoint the eyes of the blind man, if He covers them with a mass of clay, adding thus to the natural blindness an artificial blindness, and sends him to wash in Siloam, the aim of this course of action can hardly be that which *Meyer* and *Weiss* suppose,—to

<sup>1</sup> Instead of the reading of the T. R. *καὶ ἐπέχρ. τὸν π. ἐπὶ τ. ὀφθ. τὸν τυφλ.* (*he anointed with clay the eyes of*) which is supported by 14 Mj, most of the Mm. It<sup>sup</sup>, Syr<sup>sup</sup>, ἐπέθηκε is read in B C, and in **Σ B L**: *αὐτοῦ τὸν π. ἐπὶ*

*τ. ὀφθ.*; A the same, adding *τοῦ τυφλοῦ* (*he applied his clay to the eyes of*).

<sup>2</sup> This parenthesis is wanting in Syr. and in a Persian translation.

give to the organ, which had never performed its functions before, time to be formed and to be made ready to act; for when once miraculous power is admitted, it cannot be limited in this way; it is more probable that in this point also the aim of Jesus was of a moral nature. The pool of Siloam had played an important part in the feast which had come to its end. In the solemn and daily libation (p. 75), this fountain had been presented to the people as the emblem of the theocratic favors and the pledge of all the Messianic blessings. This typical significance of Siloam rested upon the Old Testament which had established a contrast between this humble fountain, springing up noiselessly at the foot of the temple-mountain (*the waters of Shiloah which flow sweetly*), emblem of the divine salvation wrought by the Messiah (*Emmanuel*), and the *great waters* (of the Euphrates), the symbol of the brute force of the enemies of the theocracy (Is. viii. 7). What then does Jesus do by adding to the real blindness of this man, which He alone can cure, this artificial and symbolic blindness, which the water of Siloam is to remove? In the first place, He expressly gives to the sacred fountain a part in His work of healing, as He had not done in chap. v. with reference to the pool of Bethesda, and He thus places this work more evidently to the eyes of all under the protection of God Himself. God is thereby associated, as it were, in this new Sabbath work (*Lange*). Then, He presents Himself as the real fountain of Siloam of which the prophet had spoken (Is. viii. 7) and thus declares to the people that this type of the grace of Jehovah is now fulfilled in Him.

It is undoubtedly this symbolic significance attributed to the water of Siloam, which explains the remark of the evangelist: *a name which signifies: Sent*. From the philological point of view, the correctness of the translation given by John is no longer disputed. It is acknowledged that the name *Siloam* is a verbal substantive or adjective from *שלח*, and derived from the passive participle Kal or rather Piel (with the solution of the daghesh forte in the ל into ם). What was the origin of this title? The pool of Siloam, discovered by Robinson near the place where the three valleys of Tyropeon, Hinnom and Jehoshaphat meet together, is fed by a subterranean conduit recently discovered, which starts from the fountain of the Virgin in the valley of Jehoshaphat and crosses in a zigzag way the side of the rock of Ophel, the southern prolongation of the temple mountain. The name *sent* can therefore be explained in this sense: water brought from far. Or we may think, with *Ewald*, of the jet itself of the spring, that is of the intermittent fountain which feeds the reservoir (see Vol. I., p. 455). Or finally we may see herein the idea of a gift of Jehovah (*Hengstenberg*), springs being regarded in the East as gifts of God. In any case, this parenthesis has as its purpose to establish a relation between this spring celebrated by the prophet as the emblem of the Messianic salvation (the typical *sent*) and the *sent one* properly so-called who really brings this salvation.

As *Franke* remarks (p. 314), this case, being the only one in which Jesus rests upon the meaning of a name, must be explained by the cir-

cumstance that Isaiah had already brought the water of Siloam into connection with the salvation of which He recognized the accomplishment in Jesus.

*Meyer* and others explain this parenthesis by supposing that John saw prefigured in this name *sent* the sending of the blind man himself to Siloam. As if there were the least logical correspondence between this sending and the name of this reservoir; as if the name of *sent* were not above all the constant title of Jesus Himself in our Gospel. To get rid of this parenthesis which embarrassed him, *Lücke* had recourse, with hesitation, to the hypothesis of an interpolation. The *Peschito* actually omits these words. But this omission in a Syriac translation is very naturally explained, since the word translated belongs to that language.

According to the Alexandrian reading, we must translate in ver. 6: "He applied *His* clay to . . ." *Weiss*, to save this objectionable reading, proposes to refer the pronoun *αὐτοῦ*, not to Jesus, but to *πνεύματος, the saliva*: "He applied the clay of the saliva." The fact is that here, as frequently, one must know how to free one's self from the prejudice which attributes to the Alexandrian text a kind of infallibility. The preposition of motion, *εἰς, into*, is used with the verb *ῥίψαι, wash*, probably because the blind man was obliged to go down into the reservoir. *Meyer* explains the *εἰς*, by mentioning that in washing, the blind man would necessarily make the clay fall into the basin (!). It is a matter of course that the blind man found a guide among the persons present. How can *Reuss* make a charge against the narrative on the point of this omission? The evangelist says: *He returned seeing*; this signifies, no doubt, that the blind man returned to the place where he had left Jesus that he might render thanks to Him, and that, not finding Him there,—Jesus was only *passing* by (ver. 1),—he returned to his dwelling. This appears, indeed, from the following expression (ver. 8): *the neighbors*, as well as from vv. 35, 37. *Reuss*: "We are not told where the man went after having washed, why he did not return to his benefactor . . ." What is to be said of such criticism?

Vv. 8-12. "His neighbors therefore, and those who before saw him begging,<sup>1</sup> said, Is not this he that sat and begged? 9. Some said, It is he; others, He is like<sup>2</sup> him. He said, I am he. 10. Thereupon they said to him, How were thine eyes opened? 11. He answered and said,<sup>3</sup> A man<sup>4</sup> called Jesus made clay and anointed my eyes, and said to me, Go to the pool of Siloam<sup>5</sup> and wash. Having gone thither and washed, I have recovered sight. 12. They said to him therefore, Where is this man? He says, I know not." These verses describe in the most natural and most dramatic way the effect produced by the

<sup>1</sup> T. R. reads τυφλος with 9 Mj.; Ⲙ A B C D K L X 10 Mm. It<sup>all</sup>q Vulg. Syr. Cop. read προσαιτης (beggar); It<sup>pericope</sup>q: τυφλος ην και προσαιτης.

<sup>2</sup> Ⲙ B C L X It<sup>all</sup>q Vulg. Syr. Cop.: ουχι αλλα ομοιος (no, but he is like him) instead of ομοιος (he is like him) which is read by T. R.

with all the rest.

<sup>3</sup> Καὶ εἶπεν is omitted by Ⲙ B C D L It<sup>all</sup>q.

<sup>4</sup> Ⲙ B L some Mm. read ο before ανθρωπος (the man).

<sup>5</sup> Ⲙ B D L X It<sup>all</sup>q. Syr<sup>sech</sup>: εἰς τον Σιλωαμ instead of εἰς τον κολ. του Σ.

return of the blind man to his home. The evangelist distinguishes from the neighbors all those, in general, who were accustomed to see him (imperfect participle *θεωροῦντες*) asking alms. The question of ver. 8 is proposed by all; but two slightly different tendencies immediately manifest themselves in the solutions given in ver. 9. Some frankly recognize the fact: "Yes, it is he." Others seem to be already preparing for themselves a means of eluding it: "He is like him." In the Byzantine reading: *He is like him*, a resemblance is conceded which is calculated to establish identity. But according to the Alexandrian variant: "No; but he is like him!" there would be already a denial of identity; everything would be reduced to an accidental resemblance. In any case, it is evidently the latter class who, upon the declaration of the blind man, present to him the questions of ver. 10 and ver. 12. The expression *recover sight* (ver. 11) arises from the fact that blindness, even from birth, is a state contrary to nature.<sup>1</sup> The question of ver. 12 betrays the intention of provoking an inquiry; it is the transition to the following passage:

## II.—*The Investigation*: vv. 13-34.

First appearance of the blind man: vv. 13-17. Confronting of the blind man with his parents: vv. 18-23. Second appearance of the blind man: vv. 24-34.

First appearance:

Vv. 13-17. "*They leud the man who was formerly blind to the Pharisees. 14. Now it was the Sabbath when<sup>2</sup> Jesus made the clay and opened the eyes of this man. 15. In their turn, the Pharisees also asked him how he had recovered his sight. He said to them, He put clay upon my eyes, and I washed, and I see. 16. Thereupon, some of the Pharisees said, This man is not from God, because he does not keep the Sabbath. Others said, How can a wicked man do such miracles? And they were divided among themselves. 17. Addressing the blind man again, they say to him, What dost thou say of him, in that he opened thine eyes? He answered, He is a prophet.*" Those who push for an investigation are the ill-disposed questioners of vv. 10, 12. The term *the Pharisees* cannot designate the entire Sanhedrim (comp. vii. 45). Had the Pharisaic party a certain organization perchance, and is the question here of its leaders? It is more natural to suppose that the question here is of the more violent ones. It was undoubtedly the day after the one on which the miracle had taken place.

Ver. 14. *Keil* remarks that the expression is not *for*, but *now* (*δέ*). There is therefore no indication here of the reason for which they brought him;

<sup>1</sup> With respect to the term *ἀνέβλεψε* (literally, *he saw again*), Meyer cites a passage from Pausanias (*Messen.*, iv. 12, 5, ed. Schubart) where that author also uses this term with reference to the cure of one born blind. To the mention of this fact, interesting in itself, we will add the following details: The question is of a Messenian diviner, named

Ophioneus, who was blind from birth (*τὸν ἐκ γενετῆς τύφλον*) and who, after a violent attack of headache, recovered his sight (*ἀνέβλεψεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ*). Pausanias adds, however, that he lost it soon afterwards.

<sup>2</sup> Instead of *στε*, **Σ B L X** Italia read *εν η* *ημερα*.

it is an incidental remark, explanatory of what follows.—The words: *He made clay* are skillfully added in order to make prominent the anti-Sabbatic work in the miracle. *Renan* says of Jesus: “He openly violated the Sabbath.” We have already seen that there is nothing of this (vol. I., p. 461). In this case, as in that of chap. v., Jesus had trampled under foot, not the Mosaic Sabbath, but its Pharisaic caricature. The word *παλιω*, *again*, alludes to ver. 10. This expression, as well as the repeated *and* in this ver. 15, indicates a certain impatience on the part of the blind man, whom these questions weary. He already penetrates their designs. Thus, also, is the somewhat abrupt brevity of his reply explained. The division which manifested itself in the public, is reproduced in this limited circle. Some, starting from the inviolability of the Sabbath ordinance, deny to Jesus, as a transgressor of this ordinance, any divine mission; from this results logically the denial of the miracle. Others, starting from the fact of the miracle, infer the holy character of Jesus, and thus implicitly deny the infraction of the Sabbath. Everything depends on the choice of the premise, and the choice depends here, as always, on moral freedom. It is at the point of departure that the friends of the light and those of darkness separate; the rest is only a matter of logic. We must not translate *ἀμαρτωλός* by *sinner*. The defenders of Jesus do not dream of affirming His perfect holiness; the termination *ωλος* expresses abundance, custom; thus: a man without principles, a violator of the Sabbath, a publican. The question addressed to the blind man in ver. 17, has as its aim to wrest from him a word which may furnish a pretext for suspecting his veracity. As for him, he recognizes in the miracle, according to the received opinion iii. 2, the sign of a divine mission, and he frankly declares it.

Confronting of the blind man with his parents :

Vv. 18–23. “*The Jews therefore did not believe concerning him, that he had been blind and had recovered his sight, until they had called the father and the mother of him who had recovered his sight; 19 and they asked them, saying, Is this your son, who you say was born blind? How then does he now see? 20. The parents answered them and said, We know that this is our son, and that he was born blind; 21 but how he now sees, we know not; or who has opened his eyes, we know not; he is of age, ask him;<sup>1</sup> he shall speak for himself. 22. The parents spoke thus, because they feared the Jews; for the Jews had already agreed that if any one should acknowledge him as the Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue. 23. Therefore said his parents, He is of age, ask him.*” By the term *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι*, *the Jews*, John does not mean to designate a group of new individuals. They are still the same; only he designates them now, no longer, from the point of view of their position in Israel, but from that of their disposition towards Jesus. The persons in question are the most hostile ones, those to whom ver. 16a refers. They suspect a collusion between Jesus and the blind man, and for this reason they wish to make inquiry of his parents. Of the three questions which ver. 19

<sup>1</sup> *Σ* omits the words *αυτον ερωτησατε* (*ask him*). B D L X It pierique place them before *ηλικιαν εχει*.

contains, the first two—those which relate to the blindness from birth of their son and the identity of the man who is cured with this son—are immediately answered by the parents affirmatively. There is something comical in the three *αὐτός, he*, by means of which they pass over from themselves to him the burden of answering the third. The term *συνετίθεντο, they had agreed*, ver. 22, denotes a decision formed, and not a mere project, as *Meyer* thinks; this follows from the word *ἤδη, already*, and from the knowledge which the parents have of this measure. The exclusion from the synagogue involved for the excommunicated person the breaking off of all social relations with those about him. The higher degree of excommunication would have had death as its result, if this penalty had been practicable under the Roman dominion. We find here a new landmark on the path of the hostile measures adopted with regard to Jesus; it is the transition between the sending of the officers (chap. vii.) and the decree of death in chap. xi. The cowardice of the parents is, as it were, the prelude of that of the whole people.

Second appearance :

Vv. 24-34. “*They called, for the second time, the man who had been blind, and they said to him, Give glory to God; we know that this man is a wicked person. 25. He answered<sup>1</sup> them, Whether he is a wicked person, I know not; one thing I know, that whereas I was blind, now I see. 26. They said to him again,<sup>2</sup> What did he do to thee? How did he open thine eyes? 27. He answered them, I told you already, and you did not hear. Why would you hear it again? Do you also wish to become his disciples? 28. They reviled him and said to him, Thou art this man’s disciple; we are disciples of Moses. 29. As to Moses, we know that God has spoken to him; but as for this man, we know not whence he is. 30. The man answered them and said, Herein,<sup>3</sup> is the marvellous<sup>4</sup> thing, that you do not know whence he is; and yet, he has opened my eyes! 31. Now, we know that God does not hear the wicked; but if any one is his worshipper and does his will, him he hears. 32. Never has it been heard that any one has opened the eyes of one born blind. 33. If this man were not from God, he could do nothing like this. 34. They answered and said to him, Thou wert altogether born in sin, and thou teachest us! And they drove him out.”* After this confronting, a deliberation intervenes; it is determined to extort from the blind man the disavowal of the miracle in the name of the Sabbatic principle, in other terms, to annihilate the fact by dogma. The expression : *to give glory to God*, denotes the homage rendered to one of the divine perfections momentarily obscured by a word or an act which seems to be derogatory to it (Josh. vii. 19; 1 Sam. vi. 5). The blasphemy here was the declaration of the blind man : *He is a prophet*. It was in contempt of the holiness and truth of God to give this title to a violator of the Sabbath. This culpable assertion must be washed away by the opposite declaration: He is a wicked person. “*We know*” say the rulers

<sup>1</sup> The Alexandrian authorities reject *καὶ εἶπεν*, which T. R. adds. *ἐν τούτῳ γὰρ*; D. Syr.: *ἐν τούτῳ οὖν*; X Δ *ἐν γὰρ τούτῳ (this one thing is)*.

<sup>2</sup> *Ν Β D* Itlerique Vulg. omit *παλιν (again)*.

<sup>3</sup> *Ν Β L 3* Mnn. Chrys. read *το before θαυμαστον*.

<sup>4</sup> T. R. with 11 Mjj.: *ἐν γὰρ τούτῳ*; *Ν Β L*:

(vv. 24, 29), setting themselves up as representatives of theological knowledge in Israel; in virtue of their knowledge, the miracle *cannot* be: therefore it *is* not. On his part, the blind man, while admitting his incompetency in theological questions, simply opposes fact to knowledge; his language becomes decidedly ironical; he is conscious of the bad faith of his adversaries. They feel the force of his position, and ask him again as to the circumstances of the fact (ver. 26), hoping to find in some detail of his account a means of assailing the fact itself. Not having succeeded in overthrowing the miracle by dogmatics, they wish to undermine it by criticism. This return to a phase of investigation already settled at once renders the blind man indignant and emboldens him; he triumphs in their impotence, and his reply borders upon irony: "You did not hear? You are deaf then!" They then cover their embarrassment by insult; between Jesus and the Sabbath, or, what amounts to the same thing, between Jesus and Moses, their choice is made. The blind man, seeing that there is a wish to argue with him, becomes more and more bold, and sets himself also to the work of arguing. If he has not studied dogmatics, he at least knows his catechism. Is there an Israelite who is ignorant of this theocratic axiom: that a miracle is an answer to prayer, and that the prayer of a wicked person is not answered. The construction of ver. 30 is doubtful. *Meyer*, *Luthardt* and *Weiss* explain: "In such a condition of things (*ἐν τούτῳ*), it is astonishing that you do not know whence he comes, and that he has opened my eyes." But, in this sense, the last words are useless. More than this, the idea: "and that he has opened my eyes" being the premise of the preceding conclusion: "whence he comes," should be placed before it. We must therefore make the *ἐν τούτῳ*, as is so frequently the case, refer to the following *ὅτι*: *in this that*, and give to the *καί* which follows the sense of *and yet* (as in so many other passages in John): "There is truly herein a marvel (without *τό*); or (with *τό*): "The real marvelous thing consists in this: that you do not know whence this man comes: and yet He has opened my eyes!" This last reading is evidently the true one. "There is here a miracle greater than even my cure itself; it is your unbelief." The *γάρ* (*for*), in Greek, often refers to an understood thought. Thus in this case: "You do not know this? *In fact*, there is something here which borders upon the marvelous!" *We know*; that is to say, we simple *Jews*, in general (ver. 31); in contrast to the proud *we know* of these *doctors*, in vv. 24, 29. The argument is compact; ver. 31 is the major premise, ver. 32 the minor, and ver. 33 draws the conclusion.

Defeated by his pitiless logic, whose point of support is simply the principle that *what is, is*, the adversaries of Jesus give way to rage. Saying to the blind man: *Thou wert altogether born in sin*, they allude to his blindness from birth, which they regard as a proof of the divine curse under which the man was born (vv. 2, 3); and they do not perceive that, by this very insult, they render homage to the reality of the miracle which they pretend to deny. Thus unbelief ends by giving the lie to itself. The expression: *they drove him out*, cannot designate an official excommunication; for this could not be pronounced except in a regular

meeting. They expelled him violently from the hall, perhaps with the intention of having the excommunication pronounced afterwards by the Sanhedrim in pursuance of a formal deliberation.

It is asked what is the aim with which John related this fact with so much of detail. No striking testimony of Jesus respecting His person marks it as worthy of attention. It refers far more, as it seems, to the history and conduct of a secondary personage, than to the revelation of Jesus Himself. Evidently John accords to this fact this honorable place because it marks in his view a decisive step in the progress of Israelitish unbelief. For the first time, a believer is, for his faith, cast out of the theocratic community. It is the first act of the rupture between the Church and the Synagogue. We shall see in the following chapter that Jesus really regards this fact in this light.

The whole scene here described has an historical truthfulness which is obvious. It is so little ideal in its nature that it rests, from one end to the other, upon the brute reality of a *fact*. Baur himself acknowledges this. "The reality of the fact," he says, "is the point against which the contradiction of the adversaries is broken."<sup>1</sup> And yet this fact, according to him, is a pure invention! What sort of a man must an evangelist be who describes, with greatest detail, a whole series of scenes for the purpose of showing how dogmatic reasoning is shattered against a fact in the reality of which he does not himself believe? Does not criticism meet the same experience which here happens to the Pharisees in ver. 34? Does it not give the lie to itself? This whole chapter presents to modern criticism its own portrait. The defenders of the Sabbath ordinance reason thus: God *cannot* lend His power to a violator of the Sabbath; therefore the miracle ascribed to Jesus *does not exist*. *A non posse ad non esse valet consequentia*. The opponents of the miracles in the Gospel history reason in exactly the same way, only substituting for a religious ordinance a scientific axiom: The supernatural *cannot* be; therefore, however well attested the miracles of Jesus may be, they are not. The historical fact holds good against the ordinance, of whatsoever nature it may be, and it will end by forcing it to submit.

### III.—The moral result : vv. 35-41.

Vv. 35-38 present the moral result of this miracle, and vv. 39-41 formulate that of the activity of Jesus in general.

Vv. 35-38. "*Jesus heard that they had driven him out; and having found him, he said to him: Dost thou believe on the Son of man?*"<sup>2</sup> 36. *He answered and said, And<sup>3</sup> who is he, Lord, that I may believe on him?* 37. *Jesus said to him, Thou hast both seen him and he that speaks with thee is he.* 38. *He said, Lord, I believe. And he prostrated himself before him.*"<sup>4</sup> In order that the true aim which Jesus proposed to Himself might be attained (vv. 3, 4),

<sup>1</sup> *Theol. Jahrb.* iii., p. 119.

<sup>2</sup> Instead of *του θεου* (of God),  $\aleph$  B D Sah. read *του ανθρωπου*.

<sup>3</sup>  $\aleph$  and) is omitted only in A L many

Mss. It. Vulg.

<sup>4</sup>  $\aleph$  omits ver. 38 and the first words of ver. 39 (as far as *εις κριμα* not inclusive).

the spiritual illumination and salvation of the blind man must result from his corporeal cure; and certainly his courageous fidelity in the face of the enemies of Jesus made him worthy to obtain this new favor. This connection of ideas is indicated by the first words of ver. 35: *Jesus heard . . . and . . .* In the question which He addresses to this man we formerly preferred the reading: *on the Son of God*, to that of the three ancient Mss. which read: *on the Son of man*. It explains better the act of worship with which the scene ends (ver. 38). *Westcott* rightly observes, however, that the substitution of the technical and popular term *Son of God* for *Son of man* is much more probable than the reverse. And he cites the very striking example of vi. 69, where the term *Son of God* has evidently taken the place in the received text of *Holy One of God*. If we must read: *on the Son of man*, the meaning is: on the man who has an exceptional place among all His brethren and who is raised up in order to save them all. The question: *Dost thou believe?* does not signify: "Art thou disposed to believe?" (*Lücke*). It is one of those questions, such as were sometimes put by Jesus, whose import goes beyond the actual light of the one to whom it is addressed, but which is, even for this reason, fitted to call forth the desired explanation. "Thou who hast just conducted thyself with so much of courage, dost thou then believe?" Jesus ascribes to the conduct of the blind man an importance which it as yet only impliedly possesses. This man had recognized Him as a prophet and had courageously proclaimed Him as such; he had thus morally bound himself to receive the testimony of Jesus respecting Himself, whatever it might be. The blind man accepts without hesitation this consequence of his previous words. And this relation it is which is expressed with much vivacity by the particle *kai, and*, at the beginning of his question. This copula serves indeed to identify the light which he waits for with that for which the question of Jesus makes him hope; comp. Luke xviii. 26. Jesus might have answered: It is I, myself. He prefers to designate Himself by a periphrasis recalling to him who was previously blind the work which he has accomplished on his behalf: *Thou hast seen him*, and which gives a warranty to His present testimony: *It is he who speaks to thee*. The first *kai* in the reply of Jesus: *Thou hast both seen him*, connects this revelation with the promise of faith which the blind man has just made to Him. The successive *kai* set forth the ready, easy, natural linking together of all the moral facts which form the course of this story. In this rapid development, one step does not wait for another. Ver. 38 shows us the consummation of this gradual illumination. In these circumstances, in which there was neither pardon to ask for, nor supplication to present, the genuflexion could be only a homage of worship, or at least of profound religious respect. The term *προσκύβειν*, to prostrate oneself, is always applied in John to divine worship (iv. 20 ff. xii. 20).

In the presence of this man prostrate at His feet and inwardly illuminated, Jesus feels Himself called to proclaim a general result which His ministry will have throughout the whole world, and of which the event which has just occurred is, as it were, a first example.

Vv. 39-41. "And Jesus said, I am come into this world to exercise this judgment, that those who see not may see, and that those who see may become blind. 40. And those of the Pharisees who were with him heard these words<sup>1</sup> and they said to him, And are we also blind? 41. Jesus said to them, If you were blind, you would not have sin; but now you say, We see; therefore,<sup>2</sup> your sin remains."<sup>3</sup> Here is a simple reflection to which Jesus gives utterance, and which is connected with the dignity of *light of the world* which He had attributed to Himself at the beginning of this scene (ver. 5). So the verb εἶπεν, *he said*, is left without a limiting personal object such as: to them. The coming of Jesus has for its end, strictly, to enlighten the world; but as this end cannot be attained in all, because all are not willing to allow themselves to be enlightened, it has another secondary end: that those who reject the light should be blinded by it. It is not necessary to see in the term κρίμα, *judgment*, the indication of a judicial act. Such a judgment had been denied in iii. 17. The question is of a moral result of the attitude taken by the men themselves with regard to Jesus, but a result which was necessary and willed from on high (ἵζθθον εἰς). The term *in this world* recalls the expression: *light of this world* (ver. 5). The greater part of the interpreters (*Calvin, Lücke, Meyer*, etc.) give to the expression: *Those who see not*, a subjective meaning: "Those who feel and acknowledge that they do not see." This interpretation arbitrarily weakens the sense of the expression employed by Jesus and it does not suit the context, since the man whose cure occasions these words, did not feel his blindness more than other blind persons, and since, speaking spiritually, he did not simply feel himself more ignorant than others, but he was so in reality. *Those who do not see* are therefore men who are really sunk in spiritual ignorance. They are those whom the rulers themselves call in vii. 49: "This multitude who know not the law," the ignorant in Israel, those whom Jesus designates, Matt. xi. 25, Luke x. 21, as the *little children* (νήπιοι) contrasting them with the wise and intelligent. *Those who see* are, consequently, those who, throughout this whole chapter, have said, in speaking of themselves: *We know*, the experts in the law, those whom Jesus calls, in the passage cited, *the wise and intelligent* (σοφοὶ καὶ συνετοί). The former, not having any knowledge of their own to keep, yield themselves without difficulty to the revelation of the truth, while the others, not wishing to sacrifice their own knowledge, turn away from the new revelation, and, as we have just seen in this chapter, presume even to annihilate the divine facts by their theological axioms. Hence it results that the former are immediately enlightened by the rays of the sun which rises upon the world, while the imperfect light which the latter possess is transformed into complete darkness. We must notice the delicate contrast between μὴ βλέποντες (*those who see not*) in the first clause, which denotes a sight *not yet* developed, and τυφλοί, *blind*, in the second, which denotes the absolute blindness resulting from the

<sup>1</sup> N D Itperique Vulg. Cop. omit πάντα.

<sup>3</sup> D L X: αἱ ἀμαρτίαι . . . μένουσιν (instead of the singular).

<sup>2</sup> N B D K L X some Mnn. Itperique Vulg. Cop. omit οὖν (*therefore*).

destruction of the organ. This passage expresses, therefore, the same thought as the words of Jesus in the Synoptics: "*I thank thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and intelligent, and hast revealed them unto babes*" (Matt. xi. 25; Luke x. 21). Meyer objects that in this sense the *seeing* or *not seeing* would relate to the law and the *becoming blind* to the Gospel, that there would thus be a twofold relation which is not to be accepted. But in the view of Jesus (comp. v. 45 ff.), the law, when thoroughly understood, and the Gospel are only one and the same increasing moral light. The knowledge of the law must lead, if it is earnestly applied, to the acknowledgment of the Gospel; if the latter had not come, the law itself would have covered the sight with an impenetrable veil (2 Cor. iii. 14, 15).

The Pharisees who were at this moment in the company of Jesus, ask Him ironically if He ranks them also, the doctors of Israel, in the number of the blind. I do not think that they make a strict distinction between the *non-seeing* and the *blind* of ver. 39. They keep to the general idea of *blindness* and ask if He applies it to them also.

The answer of Jesus to this sarcasm (ver. 41) is one of crushing severity. Instead of treating them as blind, as they no doubt expected, Jesus says to them, on the contrary: "It were a thing to be wished for, for your sakes, that you were so!" The expression: *Those who see not*, in this answer, designates those who have not the religious knowledge furnished by the profound study of the law. If those who interrogate Him at this moment had belonged to the ignorant portion of the nation, their unbelief might have been only a matter of surprise or of seduction, something like that *sin against the Son of man which can be forgiven in this age or even in the other*. But such is not their position. They are possessed of *the key of knowledge* (Luke xi. 52), they possess the knowledge of the law and the prophets. It is, then, with full knowledge that they reject the Messiah: *Behold the Son, this is the heir; come, let us kill him, and the inheritance shall be ours*. Here is the exact rendering of their feeling. Their unbelief is the rejection of the truth discerned; this is what renders it unpardonable: *ἀμαρτία μένει, their sin remains*. Weiss gives to this last word a slightly different sense: the sin of unbelief *remains* in them because the pride of their own knowledge prevents them from attaining to faith. But the expression *sin which remains* has certainly a more serious meaning (iii. 36); it has reference to the divine judgment. The meaning of this verse which we have just set forth (comp. *Luthardt, Weiss*, etc.) appears to me more natural than that given by *Calvin, Meyer* and most: "If you felt your ignorance, I could heal you; but you boast presumptuously of your knowledge; for this reason your malady is incurable." The expression: *You say (yourselves say)*, proves nothing in favor of this meaning and against that given by us, as *Meyer* asserts. These words contain, indeed, an allusion to the ironical question of the Pharisees (ver. 40), by which they had denied their blindness. *Their own mouth* had thus testified that it was not light which had been wanting to them. "You yourselves acknowledge, by saying constantly, *We know*, that you are not of those who are

ignorant of the preparatory revelations which God has granted to His people. You are therefore without excuse."

The relation here indicated between the ignorant and the learned in Israel is reproduced on a large scale in the relation between the heathen and the Jews, and with the same result. The sin of the heathen, who so long persecuted the Church, has been forgiven them, while the crime, consciously committed by Israel, of rejecting the Messiah, still rests upon that people. Jesus knew well that this judgment, in which His coming must issue, embraced the whole world; this is the reason why He said in ver. 39: "I am come *into this world*, in order that . . ." We shall find the same sentiment at the basis of the following section. Comp. x. 3, 4, 16.

## SECOND SECTION.

### X. 1-21.

#### THE FIRST DISCOURSE.

The following discourse includes three parables: that of the *shepherd* (vv. 1-6), that of the *gate* (vv. 7-10), and that of the *good shepherd* (vv. 11-18); the section closes with an historical conclusion (vv. 19-21).

This discourse is not, like those of chaps. v. and vi., the development of a theme relating to the person of Christ, and suggested by the miracle which had preceded. Jesus does not explain here, on occasion of the healing of the man born blind, how He is the light of the world (ver. 4). But the discourse is, nevertheless, in close connection with the facts related in the preceding chapter; it is, properly speaking, only the reproduction of those facts in a parabolic form. The violent breaking in of the thieves into the sheepfold represents the tyrannical measures of the Pharisees in the theocracy, measures of which the ninth chapter has just presented a specimen; the attraction which the voice of the shepherd exercises upon the sheep and the fidelity with which they continue to follow his steps, recalls the simple and persevering faith of the blind man; finally, Jesus' action, full of tenderness towards this maltreated and insulted man, is found again in the picture of the good shepherd intervening on behalf of his sheep.

These three parables form three progressive pictures. On the occasion of the violent expulsion of the man born blind, Jesus sees the true Messianic flock separating itself from the ancient Israelitish community and grouping itself around Him; this is the first picture, vv. 1-6. Then, He describes the glorious prerogatives which, by His means, the flock once formed shall enjoy, in contrast to the cruel fate which is reserved for the ancient flock which remained under the egoistic and mischievous direction of its present leaders; this is the second picture, vv. 7-10. Finally, He places in a clear light the sentiment which is the soul of His Messianic ministry: disinterested love of the flock, in contrast to the mercenary spirit of the earlier shepherds; this is the third picture, vv. 11-18. We see that there is nothing vague or commonplace in these descriptions. They are the

faithful reflection of the state of things at the very moment when Jesus was speaking. Thus three ideas: 1. The way in which the Messiah forms His flock; 2. The way in which He feeds it; 3. The motive which urges Him to act thus; and in each case, as a contrast, the description of the ministry opposed to His own, as the theocracy at that time presented the example of it.

I.—*The Shepherd*: vv. 1-6.

Vv. 1-5. "*Verily, verily, I say unto you that he who does not enter by the door into the sheep-fold, but climbs up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber; 2 but he who enters in by the door is the shepherd of the sheep. 3. To him the porter opens; and the sheep hear his voice; and he calls<sup>1</sup> his own sheep by their name and leads them out. 4. And when he has put forth all his own sheep,<sup>2</sup> he goes before them, and the sheep follow him because they know his voice; 5 they will not follow<sup>3</sup> a stranger, but will flee from him, because they know not the voice of strangers.*" This picture deserves the name of allegory rather than that of parable. In the parable, there is a story which assumes a form independent up to a certain point of the moral application; in the allegory, the application makes itself felt immediately through every feature of the representation: the image does not take a form independent of the thought. The parable is a picture, the allegory a transparency. The Synoptics also present pictures of this sort; for example, that of the leaven and the grain of mustard-seed.

It has been supposed that the figures employed here by Jesus must have been borrowed from the spectacle which He had before His eyes at this very moment; that it was the hour when the shepherds brought back their flocks from the surrounding country into the city of Jerusalem;<sup>4</sup> and this supposition might be extended to the second picture by holding that Jesus was near the *sheep-gate* when He uttered the words of ver. 7 ff.<sup>5</sup> These suppositions have no impossibility. But as Jesus, in the preceding discourses, has applied to Himself several theocratic symbols, it is possible that He continues the same method. David invoked the Lord as his shepherd (Ps. xxiii.). Jehovah, in His highest manifestation, as Messiah, was represented by the prophets as the shepherd of Israel: Is. xl. 11; Ezek. xxxiv.; Zech. xi. The last passage in particular offers a quite remarkable analogy to the present situation. Like the shepherd of Zechariah, Jesus at this moment, after having vainly sought to gather Israel, renounces the hope of saving the nation; and leaving to the Pharisees (the foolish shepherd of whom Zechariah speaks) the direction of the main portion of the flock, He confines himself to bringing out of this fold which is about to be destroyed the few *poor sheep* who, like this blind man, look to Him.

<sup>1</sup> Instead of *καλει*,  $\aleph$  A B D L X some Mnn. read *φωνει*.

<sup>2</sup> Instead of *idia probata*, B D L X some Mnn. It<sup>all</sup> Cop. read *idia παντα* (*all*).  $\aleph$  and some Vss. read simply *σα idia*.

<sup>3</sup> Some (A B D etc.): *ακολουθησουσιν*; T. R. with others ( $\aleph$  K L etc.) *ακολουθησωσιν*.

<sup>4</sup> Neander, in his lectures.

<sup>5</sup> F. Bovet, *Voyage en Terre-Sainte*.

*Lücke* correctly observes that the formula *amen, amen*, never begins anything altogether new. It unites closely what follows with what precedes, either as a confirmation or as an antithesis. A sheep-fold in the East is not a covered building, like our stables: it is a simple inclosure, surrounded by a palisade or wall. The sheep are taken into it in the evening. Several flocks are ordinarily brought together in such an inclosure. The shepherds, after having committed them to the care of a common keeper, the porter, who, during the night, is charged with watching over their safety, return to their homes; in the morning, they return and knock at the door of the inclosure which is strongly fastened; the keeper opens it. They then separate each one his own sheep, by calling to them, and after having gathered their flock lead them to pasturage. As for robbers, it is by climbing the wall of the inclosure that they try to enter into the fold. To recall to mind these details which *Bochart* has described in his *Hieroicoicon*, and which are confirmed by modern travelers, is almost to have explained our allegory. It is impossible for me to understand how *Weiss* can deny that the sheepfold denotes the theocracy, or more exactly the Kingdom of God in its preparatory form. According to him, this figure does not have in itself any value and is only a condition for the setting forth of two different ways of acting, that of the shepherd and that of the robbers, which are to be described. But ver. 16 says quite plainly that Israel is the *αὐλή*, the inclosure of the sheep. There is a shade of difference between the *κλεπτής* or *thief* and the *λῃστής* or *robber*; the second term suggests a more marked degree of violence and audacity than the first. The one steals, the other slaughters. Jesus means to describe thereby the audacity full of cunning with which the Pharisees had succeeded in establishing their authority in the inclosure of the people of God, beyond the limits of any charge instituted by God. Nothing in the law, indeed, justified the mission which this party had arrogated to itself in Israel, and the despotic power which it exercised. In opposition to this unauthorized ministry, the figure of *the door* quite naturally designates the legitimate entrance, consequently a *divinely instituted* function—in the context, especially the Messianic office announced and prefigured in the whole of the Old Testament. We need not allow ourselves to be turned aside from this altogether natural sense of the figure, as it results from the contrast between vv. 1 and 2, by the declaration of Jesus in ver. 7. That verse is not the explanation of the present parable; it is the beginning of a new parable in which different, although analogous, figures are freely employed in the service of an altogether different idea. Some interpreters, *Lücke*, *Meyer*, *Reuss*, *Luthardt*, etc., regard the *door* in this first parable as representing the person of the Lord Himself. Consequently they see in the shepherds who enter in by the door the true leaders of the sheep, who are introduced to them by Jesus. But with what fitness would Jesus proceed to speak here of the future pastors of His Church? Still if the disciples had played a part in the preceding narrative, this might help us to understand an anticipation which is so improbable! The door represents the Messianic office divinely instituted

and forming the legitimate entrance into the theocracy prepared for its normal leader, the shepherd, that is to say, the Messiah. Undoubtedly, the word ποιῆν, *shepherd*, is in the Greek without an article, and consequently an adjective word. It designates the quality, not the individual : he who enters as *shepherd* (opposed to : as *robber*). But this form does not at all prevent the application of this figure to Jesus (ver. 12). He who comes in the character of shepherd has no need, like a robber, to scale the wall of the inclosure : the porter opens to him. Who is this *porter* ? Quite naturally : he who is charged by God with introducing the Messiah into His divine office. Can it be, as *Bengel*, *Hengstenberg* and *Gess* think, the Father, who draws souls to the Son (vi. 44) ? But God, the owner of the flock, cannot be fitly represented as a servant of an inferior order, subordinate to the shepherd himself. According to *Stier* and *Lange*, He is the Holy Spirit : the same objection. Moreover, Jesus must designate by this figure an historical function, a ministry as positive as that of the Messiah Himself. According to *Chrysostom*, he is Moses, inasmuch as the law leads to Christ. This is very far fetched and refined. *Lampe* understood by the porter all those who were expecting Christ in Israel, and more especially John the Baptist. It seems to me that the nature of things and the beginning of our Gospel prove very clearly that Jesus, in expressing Himself in this way, thought of the forerunner and of the forerunner only. God had raised up John the Baptist expressly to point out the Messiah to the people and to introduce Him into their midst : "There appeared a man sent from God to bear testimony to the light, to the end that all might believe through him" (i. 6, 7). It was he whose testimony had brought to Jesus His first believing followers, and should have opened to Him the heart of the whole people. As to those who, like *Lücke*, *de Wette*, *Meyer*, *Luthardt*, *Weiss*, see in this point only an embellishment of the picture without application, there is no argument, properly so called, to oppose them. This is a matter of feeling. My impression is that every point in this picture answers to an historical reality.

It is not only the mode of entrance which distinguishes the shepherd from the robber ; it is also the manner in which, when he has once entered, he acts towards the flock. The robber lays hold of the sheep by violent measures ; the shepherd simply makes them hear his voice, and *his* sheep, immediately recognizing it, separate themselves from among those which belong to other shepherds and come to gather around him. The words : *the sheep hear his voice*, might refer to all the sheep contained in the inclosure, and the words which follow : *his own sheep*, apply solely to the sheep of the Messiah. But the expression : *hear his voice*, is used throughout all this passage in too internal a sense to apply to the purely outward hearing, as would be the case with the first sense. It appears to me, therefore, that it is better to apply the first words of ver. 3 already to the sheep of the Messiah in the theocracy, and that, if Jesus afterwards adds the epithet *idia* (*his own*), it is, not to distinguish them from the preceding, but to emphasize the altogether new value which they acquire for His

heart, when once, through the act of faith, they have really become His. These remarkable expressions rest upon the fact that between the voice of the Messiah and the heart of believers there exists a pre-established harmony, in virtue of which they recognize Him immediately when He shows Himself and speaks. This fact of which the experience of the first disciples (chap. i.), as well as that of the whole Church, bears witness, is explained by what has been said in the Prologue of the original pouring forth of life and light from the Logos into the human soul (i. 4, 10). It was from such words as those of our passage that John had derived that profound thought. The shepherd *pronounces* the particular name of each one of the sheep—this is the sense of the reading *φωνεῖ*—or he *summons* them to follow him by calling them by their name; this is what the reading *καλεῖ* signifies. In both cases, the question is of something more special than the general call to faith indicated by the words *his voice*. When they have once come to Him with faith, He gives them a sign of recognition and favor which is altogether personal. The name, in the Scriptures, is, as *Hengstenberg* says, the expression of the personality. This special designation which is given to each sheep is the proof of the most individual knowledge and the most intimate tenderness. Recall the name of *Peter* given to Simon (i. 43), and the apostrophe: *Mary* (xx. 16), in which Jesus sums up all that *Mary* is to Him and all that He is to her. Recall also the “Believest *thou?*” addressed to the blind man who was cured, ix. 35.

In the general picturing of the parable, the words: “*And he leads them out,*” designate the act of the shepherd leading his flock to pasturage. But the question is whether this feature refers only to the care which every shepherd gives daily to his flock, or whether it is not intended here to describe a definite historical situation: the going forth of the Messianic flock from the theocratic inclosure devoted to ruin. This sense only seems to me to correspond to the idea of the *entrance* of the Messiah into the sheepfold. In this is a historical fact to which that of the *going forth* of the shepherd and his sheep answers. *Reuss* resorts to ridicule, as usual: “If,” he says, “the question were of making the believers go forth from the ancient theocracy, these same believers would be found two lines below entering it again” (alluding to ver. 9: *will go in and go out*). But this critic forgets that this last expression is borrowed from another parable, where the figures, as we shall see, take an altogether different meaning. Jesus has recognized the signal of the inevitable separation in the treatment to which the man who was born blind has been subjected, in his violent expulsion (ix. 34), as well as in the decree of excommunication which strikes Him Himself in the person of his adherents (ix. 22); in general, in the violent hostility of which He sees Himself to be the object (chaps. vii. and viii.). And it is the result of this condition of things which He describes in the term *to lead out*, as in the words: *he calls them*, He had described the historical formation of His flock.

Thus the shepherd has *called* and then has given a mark of tenderness to the sheep who have come to gather themselves about him; and now he

causes them to go forth from the inclosure where they had been shut up. The term *ἐκβάλλειν*, to drive, cast forth, ver. 4, sets forth with emphasis the principal idea of the passage, as we have just pointed it out. This word designates an energetic and almost rough act by which the shepherd helps the sheep, which still hesitates, to break away from the other sheep of the fold and to give itself up to the chances of the new existence which the shepherd's call opens before it. The rest of the verse describes the life of the Messianic flock, thus formed, in the spiritual pastures into which its divine leader introduces it, then the persevering fidelity of the sheep, of which that of the blind man has just offered an example, and finally the intimate relation which exists henceforth between these sheep and their shepherd. There is great tenderness in the words: "When he has put them forth, he goes *before them*." While they were still in the inclosure, he remained behind to put them forth, that there might not be a single one left (*πάντα*, all, according to the Alexandrian text). But when the departure is once accomplished, He places Himself at their head, in order that He may lead the flock. We see how accurate are the slightest features of the picture. *οἶδασι*, they know, means more than *ἀκοίει*, they hear (ver. 3); the latter term designated the acceptance of the first call; the other refers to the more advanced personal knowledge which results from daily intercourse. Hence it is, no doubt, that we have the plural *οἶδασι* following the singular forms which precede.

All along the way which the sheep follow, strange voices make themselves heard, on the right hand and the left, which seek to turn them aside from the steps of the shepherd; they are those of thieves who, not being able to play openly the part of robbers, use means of seduction or intimidation, as did the Pharisees in the preceding scene (ix. 14-40). But they succeed no better in breaking the bond which has been formed, than these had succeeded by violence in preventing its formation. The sheep is for the future made familiar with the voice of the shepherd, so that every voice which is not his produces upon it a strange and repellant effect<sup>1</sup>

We have already refuted the interpretation of those who apply this picture to the *pastors* of the new covenant. Their principal reason (ver. 7: *I am the door*) has no weight, the two pictures being different, as we shall see. The figure changes, in any case, from the second to the third parable; comp. ver. 7: "I am the door;" and ver. 11: "I am the good shepherd." Why not also from the first to the second? The application to Christian pastors wholly breaks the connection of the discourse, both with the preceding scene, and with the situation of the work of Christ at this moment, and finally with the representation of the development of the national unbelief which is the object of this whole part of the Gospel.

In this passage there comes out anew, in the clearest way, the idea of

<sup>1</sup> The incident is well known of the Scotch traveler who, having met under the walls of Jerusalem a shepherd leading home his flock, exchanged clothing with him, and, thus dis-

guised, undertook to call the sheep to him. They remained immovable. The true shepherd then made his voice heard. All ran to him, notwithstanding his new dress.

the *organic unity* of the Old and New Covenant, an idea of which *Reuss* and the Tübingen school assert that no trace is to be found in the fourth Gospel.

Ver. 6. "Jesus spoke this similitude to them; but they did not understand what that meant which he spoke to them." The word, *παροιμία*, *similitude*, properly designates a by-path, hence an enigmatical discourse. It is sometimes used in the translation of the LXX. to render *maschal*; it is taken in the sense of *proverb* in 2 Pet. ii. 22. The idea of a comparison is not so expressly brought out in this term as in the term *παραβολή* (see *Westcott*). The forcible expression *τίνα ἦν*, *what was*, for *what meant*, is derived from the fact that the true essence of a word is its meaning. They did not understand; because it was morally impossible for them to apply to the Pharisees the figure of thieves and robbers.

## II.—The door: vv. 7-10.

Vv. 7-10. "Jesus therefore spoke to them<sup>1</sup> again, saying, Verily, verily I say unto you, I am the door of the sheep. 8. All<sup>2</sup> those who came before me<sup>3</sup> are thieves and robbers; but the sheep did not listen to them. 9. I am the door: if any one enters in by me, he shall be saved; and he shall go in and go out, and shall find pasture. 10. The thief comes not but to steal and to kill and to destroy; I am come that they may have life,<sup>4</sup> and that they may have it abundantly." Jesus has described the simple and easy way in which the Messiah forms His flock, in contrast with the arbitrary and tyrannical measures by which the Pharisees had succeeded in getting possession of the theocracy; He now depicts, in a new allegory, which has only a remote relation in form to the preceding (comp. the two parables which follow each other in Mark; that of the sower and that of the ear of corn, iv. 3 ff., v. 26 ff.) what He will be to His flock when once formed and gathered, the abundance of the salvation which He will cause them to enjoy, as opposed to the advantage taken of the old flock by those intruders and the destruction to which they are leading them. The word *πάλιν*, *again* (ver. 7), was wrongly rejected by the Sinaitic MS.; the copyist thought that this picture was only a continuation of the preceding (because of the analogy of the figures). This is likewise held by some modern interpreters, but, as we shall see, is untenable. *Πάλιν* indicates therefore, as in Luke xiii. 20 (where it is placed between the parables of the grain of mustard seed and of the leaven; comp. Matt. xiii. 44, 45, 47), that Jesus adds still another parable to the preceding.

The picture vv. 1-5, which described the formation of the Messianic flock and its going forth from the theocratic inclosure, was borrowed from a morning scene; the second similitude, vv. 7-10, which describes the life full of sweetness of the flock when once formed and everything which it

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  omits *παλιν*, and  $\aleph$  B *αυτοῖς*.

<sup>2</sup> *Παντες* is omitted by D b.

<sup>3</sup> *Προ εμου* is placed before *ηλθον* by T. R. with Mun. only. A B D K L X  $\Delta$  60 Mun.

Cop. place these words after *ηλθον*. They are entirely omitted in the 9 other Mjjs., 100 Mun.

It. Vg. Syr<sup>sch</sup>.

<sup>4</sup>  $\aleph$  adds *αιωνιον* (*eternal*).

enjoys through the intermediation of the Messiah, places us at mid-day. In the pasturage is an inclosure where the sheep enter and whence they go out at will. If they seek for shelter, they retire to it freely. If hunger impels them, they go forth—for the gate is constantly open for them—and they find themselves in full pasturage. They have thus at their pleasure security and food, the two blessings essential to the prosperity of the flock. In this new figure, the person of the shepherd entirely disappears. It is *the door* which plays the principal part. The inclosure here no longer represents the old covenant; it is the emblem of the perfectly safe shelter of salvation. *Lüeke, Meyer, Luthardt, Weiss, Keil* explain the words: *I am the door of the sheep*, in this way: I am the door for coming to the sheep, the door by which the true shepherds enter into the midst of the flock. But in this sense the words refer either to the shepherds of the old covenant or to those of the new. In the former case, we must suppose that the  $\epsilon\gamma\omega$ , *I*, designates the *I* of the Logos as a spirit governing the theocracy. Who can admit a sense like this? In the second, it has no fitness of any kind. Moreover, this sense is very forced. The term: *door of the sheep*, naturally means; the door which the sheep use for their own going in and going out (ver. 9).

The privilege, represented by the use which the sheep make of the door, is that which Jesus gives the believing Israelites to enjoy, by furnishing them, like the one born blind, everything which can assure their rest and salvation. *Reuss* himself, abandoning the relation established by him (vv. 1, 2) between the two parables, says: "Yet once more Jesus calls Himself the door, but this time He is so for the flock itself" (thus: no longer for the shepherd, as in the first parable).

The persons designated in ver. 8 as *thieves* and *robbers* can only be the Pharisees (ver. 1). They are characterized here from the point of view, no longer of the manner in which they have established their power in the theocracy, but of the end in view of which they exercised it and of the result which they will obtain thereby. Not only had this audacious caste unlawfully taken possession, in the midst of the people of God, of the most despotic authority, but they were still using it only in a way to satisfy their egoism, their ambition and their cupidity. Hence follows the explanation of the expression, so variously interpreted: *All those who are come before me*. Whatever certain Gnostic writers may have said in former times or *Hilgenfeld* may even now say in his desire to make our Gospel a semi-Gnostic writing,<sup>1</sup> Jesus certainly could not thus speak of Moses and the prophets, and of any legitimate theocratic authority. The constant language of the evangelist protests against such an explanation (v. 39, 45–47; vi. 45; x. 34, 35, etc.). The verb  $\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota$  (*are*), in the present tense, shows clearly that He has in view persons who were now living. If He says  $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$ , *came*, and  $\pi\rho\delta\ \epsilon\mu\omicron\nu$ , *before me*, it is because He found them already at work when He began His own working in Israel. The

<sup>1</sup> "This *before me*, embraces the whole Jewish past; and the: *all those who . . .*, applies to all the preceding leaders of the flock of God."

term *come* indicates with relation to them, as with relation to Jesus, the appearance with the purpose of exercising the government of souls among the people of God. The parable of the vine-dressers in the Synoptics is the explanation of this saying of Jesus.

This interpretation of the first words of ver. 8 follows from the context and enables us to set aside, without any long discussion, the numerous, more or less divergent, interpretations which have been proposed; that of *Camerarius*, who took  $\pi\rho\delta\ \epsilon\mu\omicron\upsilon\upsilon$  in a local sense: "passing *before* and outside the door," that of *Wolf* and *Olshausen*, who gave to  $\pi\rho\delta$  the sense of  $\chi\omega\rho\iota\varsigma$ : "separating themselves from me, the true door;" those of *Lange* who understands  $\pi\rho\delta$  in the sense of  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota$ : "in my place," and *Calov*, who makes the expression *before me* signify: "before I had sent them;" that of *Gerlach*: "before the door was opened in my person;" as well as that of *Jerome*, *Augustine*, *Melancthon*, *Luthardt*: "came of themselves, without having received a mission;" finally, that of *Chrysostom* and many others even to *Weizsäcker*: "came as false Messiahs." History does not mention any case of a false Messiah before the coming of Jesus. There is no need of renouncing, with *Tholuck* and *de Wette*, the possibility of any satisfactory solution, and declaring, with the latter, that this saying does not answer to the habitual gentleness and moderation of Jesus. As to the variant which rejects the words  $\pi\rho\delta\ \epsilon\mu\omicron\upsilon\upsilon$ , *before me* (x and others), it is only an attempt to do away with the difficulty.

The present *εἰσὶ, are*, indicates with sufficient clearness that we need not go far to find these persons. The last words: *The sheep did not hear*, remind us of the profound dissatisfaction which was left in the hearts of a multitude of Israelites by the Pharisaic teaching. John vi. 68: "*To whom shall we go?*" Matt. xi. 28-30: "*Come unto me, all ye who labor and are heavy laden, learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart; my yoke is easy, and my burden is light.*" The man who was born blind was a striking example of these souls whom the Pharisaic despotism roused to indignation in Israel.

In opposition to these pretended saviours who will be found to be in reality only murderers, Jesus renews in ver. 9 His affirmation: *I am the door*; then He develops it. *Meyer* and *Luthardt* maintain here their explanation of ver. 7, according to which Jesus is the door by which the true shepherd enters into the presence of the flock. They do not allow themselves to be held back either by the  $\sigma\omega\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ , *shall be saved*, which they understand in the sense of 1 Tim. iv. 16: "Thou shalt both save thyself and them with thyself," nor by the  $\nu\omicron\mu\eta\eta\nu\ \epsilon\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\epsilon\iota$ , *shall find pasture*, which they apply to the discovery by the shepherd of good pasturage for the flock! *Weiss* and *Kcil* acknowledge the impossibility of such interpretations and, resting upon the omission in ver. 9 of the complement  $\tau\omega\nu\ \pi\rho\beta\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$ , *of the sheep* (comp. ver. 7), they adopt a modification in the meaning of the word  $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\rho\alpha$ , *door*, and think that it is now the door by which the sheep themselves can go in and go out. But the repetition of this declaration: *I am the door*, is simply introduced by the antithesis presented in ver. 8, absolutely as the second declaration: *I am the good shep-*

*herd*, ver. 14 (comp. ver. 11) will be by the antithesis presented in ver. 13. This is shown by the two *ἐγώ* at the beginning of vv. 9 and 14. There is here then no new idea. There is a more energetic reaffirmation of the same thought; and the omission of the complement of *the sheep* results quite naturally from the uselessness of such a repetition. By saying: *If any one enters in by me*, Jesus means to speak of the entrance into the state of reconciliation, of participation in the Messianic salvation by faith. *Reuss*: "Jesus is come to open to His own the door of refuge, by receiving them into His arms. The expression *go in and go out* does not mean that the sheep will go out of salvation to enter into it again. This is what *Reuss* would be obliged to hold, however, if he were consistent with the objection which he makes to the interpretation which we have given of ver. 3. These two verbs only develop the contents of the word *σωθήσεται*, *shall be saved*. *To go in and go out* is an expression frequently employed in the Scriptures to designate the free use of a house, into which one goes or from which one departs unceremoniously, because one belongs to the family of the house, because one is *at home* in it (Deut. xxviii. 6; Jer. xxxvii. 4; Acts i. 21). *To go in* expresses the free satisfaction of the need of rest, the possession of a safe retreat; *to go out*, the free satisfaction of the need of nourishment, the easy enjoyment of a rich pasturage (Ps. xxiii.). This is the reason why the word *shall go out* is immediately followed by the words which explain it: *and shall find pasture*.

Ver. 10. From the idea of pasture Jesus deduces that of *life*; He even adds to this that of *superabundance, of superfluity*. By this He certainly does not designate, as *Chrysostom* thought, something more excellent than life, glory, for example; but He means to say that the spiritual pasturage will contain still more nourishment than that which the sheep can take to itself; comp. vi. 12, 13, and the expressions: *fullness, grace upon grace*, i. 16. Such is the happy condition of the Messianic flock; Jesus puts it in contrast with the terrible fate reserved for the mass of the people which remains under the leadership of the Pharisees. After having served for the satisfaction of their pride, ambition and cupidity, they will perish morally, and at last even externally by the effect of this pernicious guidance. It seems that the three verbs express a gradation: *κλέψῃ* (*steal*), the monopoly of souls; *θίσῃ* (*kill*) the advantage taken of them and their moral murder; *ἀπολέσῃ* (*destroy*), the complete destruction which is to result from it—all this as an antithesis to the salvation through the Messiah (vv. 9, 10). To understand such severe expressions, we must recall to mind the measures of this haughty sect in Israel. The Pharisees disposed as masters of the Divine kingdom: they assumed the attitude of accredited intercessors, distributed the certificates of orthodoxy, and caused even the legitimate rulers to tremble (xii. 42; Matt. xxiii. 13, 14, and in general the whole chapter, and Luke xi. 39, 44).

III.—*The good shepherd*: vv. 11-18.

Vv. 11-13. "I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd gives<sup>1</sup> his life for his sheep. 12. But<sup>2</sup> the hireling, who is not a shepherd and to whom the sheep do not belong, sees the wolf coming and abandons the sheep<sup>3</sup> and flees; and the wolf snatches them and scatters the flock. 13. But the hireling flees<sup>4</sup> because he is a hireling and does not care for the sheep." The first picture was all resplendent with the fresh tints of the morning; the second depicted the life and activity of the flock during the course of the day; the third seems to place us at the moment when the shadows of the night are spreading, and when the sheep, brought back to the common inclosure by the shepherd, are suddenly exposed to the attack of the wolf which at evening lies in wait on their path. Jesus here appears again in His character as shepherd. But this third allegory is not confounded with the first. The governing element in the first was the contrast between the shepherd and the thief; in this one which we are about to study, it is the antithesis of the good shepherd and the hireling guardian. The salient feature is not, as in the first picture, the legitimacy of the Messianic mission, but the disinterested love which is the moving cause of it. It is this sentiment which makes Christ not only the shepherd, but the good shepherd.

The word *καλός*, beautiful, designates with the Greeks *goodness*, as the highest moral beauty. The sequel will show in what this beauty consists. This word *καλός* explains the article *ὁ*, the: He who perfectly realizes this sublime type. Then Jesus indicates the first trait of the character of this shepherd. It is love carried to the point of complete abnegation, even to the entire sacrifice of oneself. Some (*Meyer, Luthardt*) find in the expression *ψυχὴν τιθέναι* (literally: to put his life) the idea of a pledge given: Jesus pledges His life as a ransom for ours. But this idea of a ransom is foreign to the imagery of the shepherd and the sheep, and still more to that of the wolf under which the enemy is represented. This expression may be compared with that which we find in xiii. 4: *ἱμάτια τιθέναι*, to lay aside his garments. The idea is that of laying down His life. Comp. *Huther* on 1 John iii. 16. Keil, however, alleges against this second sense the words *ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων*, on behalf of the sheep. We must therefore give to *τιθέναι* the sense of: to place at the disposal of another, to surrender, to sacrifice; comp. xiii. 37. In ver. 12, we must not add the article and translate, as *Ostervald, Arnaud, Crampon* do: who is not the shepherd. Jesus means: who is not a shepherd, who has the place of a hireling. It is not the owner of the flock who acts thus, but a hired servant to whom the owner has intrusted it. Whom did Jesus mean to designate by this person? No one, say some interpreters in reply, particularly *Hengstenberg* and *Weiss*: there is here an imaginary figure intended to make prominent by means of the contrast, that of the good shepherd. But in

<sup>1</sup> X D Italic Vulg. Aug. read *διδῶσιν* instead of *τιθῆσιν*.

<sup>2</sup> B G L omit *δε* after *μισθωτος*.

<sup>3</sup> X B L H some Mnn. omit *τα πρόβατα*.

<sup>4</sup> X B D L omit the words of T. R.: *δε μισθωτος φευγει* (but the hireling flees).

that case it would be strange for it to be described throughout two entire verses as the counterpart of that of the good shepherd, and as quite as real as the latter. Most of the interpreters think that this person represents the Pharisees. But they would be presented here in too different a light from that in which they were depicted in the two preceding similitudes. A cowardly guardian is a different thing from a robber and an assailant. And, if the hireling represents the Pharisees, who will then be typified by *the wolf*? According to *Luthardt*, this person is the principle hostile to the kingdom of God, the devil, acting by means of all the adversaries of the Church. But Jesus, in chap. viii., has completely identified Pharisaism with the diabolic principle. He cannot therefore represent the first here as a mere hireling, a cowardly friend, the other as a declared enemy. *Lange*, in his *Life of Jesus*, understands by the wolf the Roman power. But it was not really under the blows of the Roman power that Jesus fell. *Meyer* had at first applied the figure of the wolf to all anti-Messianic power, Pharisaism included; but the result of this was that the hireling fleeing before the wolf was the Pharisees fleeing before the Pharisees! He has accordingly abandoned this explanation in the 5th edition. The wolf represents, according to him, the future hireling shepherds in the midst of the Christian Church. But what could have led Jesus to express at that moment an idea like this, and how could His present hearers have caught a glimpse of this meaning? It seems to me that the figure is explained if we recall to mind, on the one hand, the fact that a *μισθωτός* is a servant for wages, and, on the other, that there were in the theocracy no other accredited and paid functionaries except the priests and Levites. These were the ones to whom God had officially entrusted the instruction and moral guidance of His people. But, during the most recent times, the Pharisaic party had so far obtained the mastery over the minds of the people, by turning to their advantage the national pride, that whoever, even among the lawful rulers of the theocracy, did not submit to them, was immediately put under the ban and brought into discredit, as in our own days whoever in the Roman Church dares to cope with the spirit of Jesuitism. There were many, undoubtedly, in Israel who would have willingly maintained the truth of God. We have as a proof of this xii. 42, so far as relates to the rulers in general, and Acts vi. 7, so far as relates to the priests in particular. But, like so many intelligent and pious bishops in the present Catholicism, they in a cowardly manner kept silent. One man alone had the courage to face this formidable conflict with the dominant party, and to expose His life for the maintenance of the divine truth and for the salvation of the sheep. The: *Crucify! crucify!* was the answer of Pharisaism, cut to the heart by the "*Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!*" The wolf represents therefore the principle positively hostile to the kingdom of God and to the Messiah, the Pharisees; and the hireling, the legitimate functionaries who by their station were called to fulfill the task which Jesus accomplished by voluntary self-devotion, the priests and Levites, accredited doctors of the law. The passage ix. 16, had already given us a glimpse

within the Sanhedrim itself of a party well disposed towards Jesus, but which did not dare openly to oppose the violent threats of the Pharisees against Him. Jesus presents here only the historical factors which have co-operated in the accomplishment of the decree of His death. He has nothing to say of the profound and divine reasons which presided over the decree itself. The word ἀρπάζει, *snatches*, applies to the *individuals* whom the wolf assails (αἰτῶ), while the action of σκορπίζειν, *to scatter*, extends to the entire flock: τὰ πρόβατα, *the flock*, a word which we must be careful not to reject with the Alexandrian authorities.

Ver. 13. The Alexandrian authorities reject the first words: "*but the hireling flees.*" In that case, the *because* which follows, refers not to the last two propositions of ver. 12, but to the one which precedes them: *he flees.* After having thus described the cowardly guardians, Jesus returns to the description of the good shepherd and his conduct towards the flock, and expressly applies to Himself (ἐγώ, *I*, ver. 14) this figure.

Vv. 14-16. "As for me, I am the good shepherd; and I know my sheep, and I am known by my sheep;<sup>1</sup> 15 as the Father knows me and I know the Father; and I give<sup>2</sup> my life for the sheep. 16. And I have other sheep which are not of this fold; these also I must bring; and they shall hear<sup>3</sup> my voice; and there shall be one flock, one shepherd." The repetition of these words of ver. 11: *I am the good shepherd*, is introduced through the contrast with the figure of the hireling (comp. ver. 9); and the epithet *good* is explained here by a new point, that of the relation full of tenderness which unites Jesus and His sheep. It is on this second point that the first—the self-devotion thus far described—rests. The word *to know* does not mean: I distinguish them from the rest of the Jews (*Weiss*). The import of this word is much more profound; and the meaning *distinguish* is not suitable in the three following sayings. Jesus penetrates with the eye of His loving knowledge the entire interior being of each one of the sheep, and perfectly discerns all which He possesses in them. For there is a close relation between this verb "*I know*," and the possessive "*my sheep.*" This knowledge is reciprocal. The believers also know what their shepherd is, all that He feels and all that He is willing to do for them. They thus live in the untroubled light of a perfect mutual knowledge. From this intimate relation between Him and His sheep, Jesus goes back to that which is at once the model and source of it: His relation to the Father. The term καθώς, *as* (literally, *according as*) does not express a simple comparison, as ὡσπερ, *as*, would do. This word characterizes the knowledge which unites Jesus with his sheep as being *of the same nature* as that which unites Him to God. It is as if the luminous medium in which the heart of the Son and the heart of the Father meet each other, were enlarged so as to become that in which the heart of Jesus and that of His sheep meet each other. The καί signifies: "And consequently." It is in

<sup>1</sup> T. R. reads with 11 Mjj., all the Mnn. Syr. γινωσκονται ὑπο τῶν ἐμῶν. N B D L It. Vulg. Cop.: γινωσκουσιν με τα εμα (and my sheep know me).

<sup>2</sup> N D: δίδωμι instead of τιθημι.

<sup>3</sup> The MSS. are divided between ακουσουσιν (B D etc.), and ακουσωσιν (N A etc.).

virtue of this relation of such intimate knowledge that He consents to give Himself for them. The words: *I give my life for the sheep*, form a sort of refrain (comp. vv. 7, 11, 18), as we have found several similar refrains in our Gospel, in moments when the feeling is exalted (iii. 15, 16; iv. 23, 24; vi. 39, 40, 44, 54). In the context, the expression *for the sheep* must be applied to believers only; but yet this phrase does not contradict that according to which "*Jesus is the propitiation, not only for our sins, but for those of the whole world*" (1 John ii. 2). For the death of Jesus, in the divine intention, is *for all*, although in reality it profits only believers. Jesus knows full well that the *ἱεὶρ, on behalf of*, will be realized only in these latter.

From these two points by which Jesus characterizes Himself as the perfect shepherd, springs the third, ver. 16. It would be impossible that the holiest and most devoted work of love should have for its object only these few believers, such as the disciples and the one born blind, who consented to separate themselves from the unbelieving people. The view of Jesus extends more widely (ver. 16), in proportion as He penetrates both the depth and the height (ver. 15). The death of a being like the Son must obtain an infinite reward. The *other sheep*, the possession of whom will compensate Him for the loss of those who to-day refuse to follow Him, are evidently the believing Gentiles. Jesus declares that He *has* them already (*ἔχω, I have*), and not merely that He *will have* them, for all that are of the truth, throughout the entire body of mankind, are His from before His coming. The question is not, I think, of a possession by reason of the divine predestination. We find here again rather one of the most profound and habitual thoughts of our Gospel, a thought which springs directly from the relation which the Prologue establishes between the Logos and the human soul (ver. 4 and ver. 10). The life and the light of the world, the Logos did not cease, even before His incarnation, to fill this office in the midst of the sinful world; and, among the heathen themselves, all those who surrender themselves and yield obedience to this inner light, must infallibly recognize in Jesus their ideal and give themselves to Him as His sheep as soon as He shall present Himself; comp. xi. 52 ("the children of God who are scattered abroad"); viii. 47 ("he that is of God hears the words of God"); xviii. 37 ("he that *is of the truth*"); iii. 21 ("he that *does the truth*, comes to the light"). The demonstrative adjective *ταύτης*, placed as it is after the substantive: "This fold," implies, according to *de Wette*, that Jesus regards the heathen nationalities also as a sort of folds, of preparatory groupings divinely instituted in order to prepare for the Gospel. But perhaps *Meyer. Weiss*, etc., are right in thinking that there is here a notion introduced into the text. However, it is incorrect to set xi. 52 in opposition to this idea, which verse by no means declares the contrary of this. The believing heathen may very well be *scattered* throughout their respective nationalities, as the believing Jews are in their own (answer to *Weiss*). *Meyer*, committing here again the error which he committed in the explanation of the first allegory—that of explaining the figures of one similitude by those of another—

understands the expression ἀγαγείν in the sense of *feed*, according to the figure of vv. 4, 9, and he is followed by *Lutherdt* and *Weiss*. But the end of the verse (καί, "and so there shall be") shows clearly that the Lord's idea is an altogether different one; it is that of *bringing* these sheep, to join them with the former ones. The Vulgate, therefore, rightly translates *adducere*. The parallel passage xi. 52: σὺναγαγείν εἰς ἐν, leads likewise to this explanation. When the *historical* application of the first similitude is missed, the meaning of the whole discourse is lost. The work of St. Paul, with the workings of the missionaries who have followed him even to our own days, is essentially what this term *bring* describes. This third similitude, announcing the call of the Gentiles, corresponds thus to the first, which described the going forth of the believers from the Synagogue. The words: *They will hear my voice*, recall the expression of the end of the Acts: "The salvation of God has been sent to the Gentiles and they will also hear it" (xxviii. 28). There is a solemnity in the last words simply placed in juxtaposition: *one flock, one shepherd*. They contain the thought which forms the text of the Epistle to the Ephesians: the breaking down of the old wall of separation between Jews and Gentiles by the death of Christ (Eph. ii. 14-17). This prophetic word is accomplished before our eyes by the work of missions in the heathen world. As to the final conversion of Israel, it is neither directly nor indirectly indicated.

These so new ideas of the death of the Messiah and of the call of new non-Jewish believers to participation in the Messianic salvation were fitted to raise many doubts in the minds of the hearers. Jesus clearly perceives it; this is the reason why He energetically affirms that the good pleasure of God rests upon this work and upon Him who executes it, and that it is the true aim of His mission to the world.

Vv. 17, 18. "Therefore does my Father love me: because I give my life that I may take it again; 18 no one takes it away<sup>1</sup> from me, but I give it of myself; I have power to give, and I have power to take it again: this commandment I received of my Father." Διὰ τοῦτο, for this reason, refers ordinarily in John to a previously expressed idea, but one which is about to be taken up and developed in the following clause, beginning with ὅτι (because). The same is the case here. It is because of His voluntary devotion to this great work (vv. 15, 16) that His Father loves Him; that is to say, He adds, because He sacrifices His life to it, and this not in order absolutely to give it up, but with the express intention of recovering it, and thus of finishing the work of which He only makes a beginning here on the earth. No doubt, the Father eternally loves the Son; but, when once made man, the Son cannot be approved and loved by Him except on condition of perfectly realizing the new law of His existence, as Son of man. Now this law, which results for Him from the solidarity in which He is bound together with a fallen race, is that of saving it by the gift of His life; and the constant disposition of the Son to accept this obligation of love, is the object of the infinite satisfaction (of the ἀγαπήν) of the Father. It is in this sense that

<sup>1</sup> NB read ἔηεν (took away) instead of ἀπέι (takes away).

St. Paul calls the death of Jesus "an offering of a sweet smell" (Eph. v. 2). The last words serve to complete the preceding idea: "because I give my life, *and because I give it* that I may take it again." The self-devotion of the Son who consents to give His life is infinitely pleasing to the Father, but on one condition; that this gift be not the abandoning of humanity and of the work begun in it, which would be at the same time the forgetting of the glory of the Father. In other terms, the devotion to death would be of an evil sort if it had not for its end the return among men by means of the resurrection. As *Luthardt* with perfect correctness remarks: "Jesus must wish to resume His life again in order to continue, as glorified, His ministry of shepherd to the Church, especially to the Gentiles whom He has the mission to gather together (Eph. ii. 17)." The supreme end indicated in ver. 16 requires not only His death, but also His resurrection. It appears from the words: *that I may take it again*, that Jesus raises Himself from the dead. And this is true, for if it is in the Father that the power lies which gives Him life, it is Himself who by His free will and His prayer calls upon His person the display of this power. Ver. 18 is the emphatic reaffirmation of this character of freedom in the work of the Son, which alone makes it the object of the Father's satisfaction. Hence the *asyndeton*. It is not through powerlessness that the shepherd will succumb to the hostile power; there will come a moment when He will Himself consent to His defeat (xiv. 31). The word *ὅνδεῖς*, *no one*, includes every creature; we may include in it God Himself, since if, in dying, the Son obeys the decree of the Father, He yet does it freely; God neither imposes on Him death nor resurrection. The words *ἐξουσίαν ἔχω*, *I have the power* (the competency, the authority), are repeated with a marked emphasis; Jesus had no obligation to die, not only because, not having sinned, He had the right to keep His holy life, but also because, even at the last moment, He could have asked for *twelve legions of angels*, who would have wrested Him from the hands of His enemies. In the same way, in giving up His life, it depended on Himself to demand it again or not to reclaim it. As *Luthardt* says: "In these two acts, the action of the Son comes before the action of the Father." The last words: *I have received this commandment*, are ordinarily referred to the commandment to die and rise again which had been given to Him by the Father. But would not such an idea tend to weaken all that Jesus had just developed? The true movement of the passage is the affirming of the full independence of the Lord. This is the reason why it seems to me that it is better to apply the term *τὴν ἐντολὴν*, *this command*, to the commission with which Jesus has come to the earth and which gives Him the right to make free use of His own person, to die and to revive at will. The tenor of this commission, when the Father sent Him, was this: "Thou canst die or not die, rise again or not rise again, according to the free aspirations of thy love." Jesus calls it a *command* in order to cover with the veil of humility this incomparable prerogative.

IV.—*Historical Conclusion*: vv. 19-21.

Vv. 19-21. “*There was therefore<sup>1</sup> again a division among the Jews because of these discourings. 20. Many<sup>2</sup> of them said, He is possessed of a demon, and is mad; why do you listen to him? 21. Others said, These are not the discourings of one possessed; can a demon open the eyes of the blind?*” Always the same result; a division, which forms the prelude to the final choice; comp. vii. 12, 30, 31, 40, 41; ix. 8, 9, 16. The word *πάλιν*, *again*, awakens the attention of the reader to the constant repetition of this result. The words: Why do you listen to Him? show with what uneasiness the decidedly hostile party observed the favorable impression produced by the discourses of Jesus on those who were better disposed. The answer of these latter (ver. 21) contains two arguments in juxtaposition. The first is the simple avowal of their impression: the discourse of Jesus does not appear to them to be that of a madman. But immediately they seem to be ashamed of this avowal and withdraw behind another argument which is less compromising: the patent fact of the cure of the blind man. The second argument might be connected with the first by an *And besides*.

Thus continually more and more do the sheep of Jesus in the vast inclosure of the theocracy separate themselves from the mass of the flock; and for the theme: *I and you*, which was that of chap. viii. is substituted more and more that theme which is to sum up the new situation: *I and mine*.

## THIRD SECTION.

## X. 22-42.

## THE SECOND DISCOURSE.

In chap. vii., vv. 19-24, we have seen Jesus return, in a discourse pronounced at the feast of Tabernacles, to the fact of the healing of the impotent man (chap. v.), and thus finish His justification of Himself which was begun at Jerusalem several months before (v. 17-17), at the preceding feast. The same is the case here. In the second part of chap. x. (22-42), He resumes the thread of the discourse pronounced after the cure of the man who was born blind, at the feast of Tabernacles, and thus completes the teaching begun in the previous visit. We have explained this mode of action (vol. I., p. 450). The exasperation of His adversaries in the capital not permitting Him to treat the questions in full, He takes them up with a new beginning at a succeeding visit.

The feast of the Dedication (ver. 22) was celebrated about the middle of December. Two months must therefore have elapsed between the feast of Tabernacles and this feast. Where did Jesus pass all this time? As no change of place is indicated and as, in ver. 42, Jesus is plainly again *in Jerusalem*, Hengstenberg, Meyer, Weiss, and others infer from this that Jesus

<sup>1</sup> ⋈ B L X It. reject *ouv*.<sup>2</sup> ⋈ D add *ouv* here.

remained during this whole period in the capital and its neighborhood; the last named, without hesitation, treat as a harmonistic expedient every opposite idea. But there is nothing less certain than the conclusion thus drawn from the silence of John. At the end of chap. v. the evangelist does not in any way mention the return of Jesus to Galilee, and yet it is there that the Lord is found again in the beginning of chap. vi. Still more; there is nothing more improbable than so prolonged a sojourn of Jesus in Jerusalem or in its neighborhood at this time. Let us recall all the precautions which Jesus had been obliged to take, in order to repair to that city at the feast of Tabernacles, that He might give to this visit the character of a surprise. Why? Because, as is said in vii. 1, "Jesus would not go into Judea, because the Jews sought to kill Him." And yet in such a state of things, He could have remained two whole months peaceably in Jerusalem in the presence of the hostile party, and after the conflict had been still further aggravated by the violent scenes related in chaps. vii.-x. 21! Such a sojourn could only have determined the catastrophe before the time (vii. 6). This impossible supposition is, moreover, positively incompatible with John's narrative. In the discourse in x. 25-30, Jesus reproduces in substance that which He had pronounced after the cure of the man who was born blind; He even expressly cites it (ver. 26: *as I said to you*). This fact implies that it was the first time that He found Himself face to face with the same hearers since the feast of Tabernacles, where He had used this allegory of the shepherd and the sheep. Finally, this supposition of a sojourn of two months in Judea between the feast of Tabernacles and that of the Dedication is certainly false, if the narrative of St. Luke is not a pure romance. Luke describes in the most circumstantial and dramatic way the departure of Jesus from Galilee, and His farewell to that province, in order to repair to Jerusalem (Luke ix. 51 ff.). He shows how Jesus gave to this act the most striking notoriety by the solemn threatenings addressed to the cities where He had accomplished His ministry, and by the sending out of the seventy disciples, who should prepare His way in southern Galilee, as far as Peræa, that is to say, in all the country through which He was about to go to Jerusalem for the last Passover. How could this departure accomplished with such great publicity be identified with the journey to the feast of Tabernacles mentioned by John in chap. vii., a journey which, according to ver. 10, was made *as it were in secret* and which brought Jesus *suddenly* to Jerusalem? It is to this, however, that the matter must resolve itself, if, after the journey in John vii., Jesus did not return to Galilee. Would it be true historic impartiality to condemn purely and simply one of the two narratives, when they can be so easily reconciled with each other! Jesus, after the feast of Tabernacles, returned to Galilee which He had left so suddenly, just as He had returned thither after the feast of Purim (end of chap. v.). He resumed His work there also for a certain time. Then (Luke ix. 51 ff.) He called upon His adherents to sever the last bonds, in order to follow Him to Jerusalem; He sent before Him the seventy disciples, to the end of preparing by this

means the last appeal which He desired Himself to address to the cities and villages of southern Galilee which had not yet been visited, and it was then that He pronounced the condemnation of the cities on the borders of the lake of Gennesareth, the constant witnesses of His ministry. This prolonged pilgrimage, the account of which fills nine chapters of the Gospel of Luke (ix. 51-xviii. 18), must have been interrupted, according to this same Gospel—a strange circumstance—by a brief journey to Jerusalem; for the story in Luke x. 38-42 (Jesus in the house of Martha and Mary) which is placed, one knows not how, in the midst of this journey, transfers the reader all at once to Bethany, and the parable of the Good Samaritan, which immediately precedes, seems also to be connected with a visit to Judea. What means this excursion to Jerusalem implied in the narrative of Luke, perhaps without a knowledge of it on his part (for he does not mention Bethany)? How is it possible not to be struck with the remarkable coincidence between this journey and the journey to the feast of the Dedication related by John? After this rapid excursion to Jerusalem, Jesus proceeds to resume His slow journeying in the south of Galilee; then He crosses the Jordan to go into Peræa, as is distinctly stated by Matthew and Mark. This sojourn in Peræa, a little while before the Passion, is the point where the four Gospel narratives meet together. Compare indeed Matt. xix. 1; Mark x. 1, and Luke ix. 51; then Luke xviii. 15 ff., where the parallelism recommences between the narrative of this last writer and that of the other two Synoptics (the presentation of the young children, the coming up of the rich young man), and finally John x. 40-42. While following their own particular course, the four narratives are thus without difficulty harmonized.<sup>1</sup>

The following passage includes an historical introduction (vv. 22-24), a first address of Jesus, in which He shows the Jews the moral separation which exists between them and Himself (vv. 25-31), and a last teaching by means of which He seeks yet once more to remove what was for them the great stumbling-stone, the accusation of blasphemy (vv. 32-39). The passage closes with the description of the sojourn in Peræa (vv. 40-42).

#### I.—*Historical Introduction*: vv. 22-24.

Vv. 22-24. "Now<sup>2</sup> they were celebrating the feast of the Dedication at Jerusalem;<sup>3</sup> it was winter. 23. And Jesus was walking about in the temple, in Solomon's porch. 24. The Jews therefore surrounded him; and they said to him, How long wilt thou hold our minds in suspense? If thou art the Christ, tell<sup>4</sup> us plainly." The feast of the Dedication (ἐγκαίνια) was instituted by the Maccabees in remembrance of the purification of the temple after its profanation by Antiochus Epiphanes (1 Macc. iv.; Josephus, *Antiq.*, xii. 7. 6). It continued eight days, following the 25th of Cisleu, which, if it was

<sup>1</sup> It was in an analogous way that Tatian in the 2d century established the succession of the events, in the first known *Gospel Harmony*, the *Diatessaron*; comp. Zahn, *Tatians Diatessaron*, p. 259.

<sup>2</sup> B L substitute τότε (*then*) for δέ.

<sup>3</sup> B D G L X Π Italic Cop. omit καί before χειμων ην, which is read by T. R. with all the rest.

<sup>4</sup> S: ειπον, instead of ειπε.

then the year 29 of our era, fell in that year, according to the work of M. Chavannes cited on page 42, on the 19th or 20th of December. It was called τὰ φῶτα, *the lights*, because of the brilliant illumination with which it was celebrated, not only at Jerusalem, but in the whole country. Jesus took advantage of it to address once more, before the Passover, a last appeal to His people. We may conclude from what precedes that He probably made this rapid journey to Jerusalem while the seventy disciples were accomplishing in Galilee the mission which He had intrusted to them, and were there preparing the way from place to place for His last appeal. We have seen that He had probably accomplished the journey at the feast of Purim (John v.) while the Twelve were fulfilling a similar mission in Galilee (vol. I., p. 453).

It was the unfavorable season of the year; and it was not possible to remain in the open air. Jesus, therefore, took his position in Solomon's porch, an ancient peristyle situated in the eastern part of the court, above the valley of Jehoshaphat. It was the last remnant of the ancient temple. This place which had been rendered dear to the heart of the evangelist by the remembrance of the circumstance which he is about to relate, seems to have been equally sacred to the Christians of the primitive church of Jerusalem (Acts iii. 11). The nature of the place facilitated (*therefore*, ver. 24) the kind of manœuvre which was executed at the moment by the Jews and which is described by the term ἐκύκλωσαν, *they surrounded him*. While Jesus was walking about in this peristyle, they took advantage of a favorable moment to place themselves between Him and His disciples and to force Him to speak. It appears to me that this must be the meaning of this strange expression: they surrounded Him in a circle. The scene of viii. 25 is renewed here in an intensified degree. They are weary of His answers which seem to them ambiguous. Some among them feel indeed that no man had ever so nearly approached the Messianic ideal. Let Him finally consent to play in earnest the part of the Messiah and to free the country from the Roman power, as formerly Judas Maccabæus purified the temple from the Syrian profanations, and they will willingly hail Him, and that at this very festival; if not, let Him frankly avow that He is not the Messiah, and not continue to excite the expectation of the people! We thus picture to ourselves the general sentiment. Some, more ill-disposed, wished perhaps—this is the idea of *Weiss*—to extort from Him the term *Christ*, in order that they might accuse Him. The expression τὴν ψυχὴν αἰρεῖν, properly, *to raise the mind*, is applied to all lively emotions; see in the Greek tragic poets. Here it expresses the expectation which an activity like that of Jesus excited, an activity which awakened all the national hopes without ever satisfying them. Philo uses the term μετεωρίζειν in exactly the same sense.

## II.—First address: vv. 25–31.

Vv. 25, 26. "*Jesus answered them, I told you and you do not believe; the works which I do in my Father's name, these works bear witness of me.* 26,

But, as for you, you do not believe; for <sup>1</sup> you are not of my sheep, as I said to you." <sup>2</sup> The position of Jesus with relation to the Jews had never been so critical. To answer yes, is not possible for Him; for the meaning which they give to the term *Christ* has, so to speak, nothing in common with that which He Himself attaches to it. To say no, is still less possible; for He is indeed the Christ promised of God, and, in this sense, the one whom they expect. His reply is admirable for its wisdom. He refers, as in viii. 25, to His testimonies in which He had applied to Himself the Messianic symbols of the old covenant and in some sort spelt out His title of Christ, so that if they *were willing* to believe, they had only to pronounce it themselves.<sup>3</sup> Thus is His reply explained. The verb: *I said to you*, has no object; it is easy to supply the ellipsis: that which you ask me. To His own testimony, if it does not appear to them sufficient, there is added, moreover, that of the Father. His miracles were all *works of the Father*; for they were wrought with the invocation of His name; if Jesus were an impostor, would God have answered him thus? If these testimonies failed with them, it is the result of their unbelief (ver. 26). He is not the Messiah whom their heart demands: this is the reason why they affect not to understand what is so clear. The subject *ὑμεῖς, you*, placed at the beginning, signifies: It is not I, it is you, who are responsible for this result. And the following declaration: *You are not of my sheep*, shows them that the moral disposition is what is wanting to them that they may recognize in Him the divine Shepherd. The formula of quotation: *as I said to you*, is omitted by the Alexandrian MSS. But perhaps this omission arises from the fact that these words were not found textually in the preceding discourses. The authority of 12 Mjj., supported by that of the most ancient Vss., appears to us to guarantee their authenticity. In our first edition, we made them the preamble of ver. 27, especially because of the relation between the contents of this verse and that of vv. 3-5. The pronoun *ὑμῶν, you*, however ("as I said to you"), favors rather the connection of this formula of quotation with ver. 26. For Jesus has never applied to the unbelieving Jews the promises of ver. 27; while He has frequently addressed to them charges equivalent to that of ver. 26. The charge of *not being His sheep* really formed the basis of the parables, vv. 1-5 and vv. 7-10, in which Jesus had distinguished clearly from His sheep the mass of the people and their rulers, His interlocutors in general. *Reuss*: "Jesus had nowhere said this." Then again: "The allegory of the sheep," he says, "had been presented to an entirely different public." Finally, he maliciously adds: "It is only the readers of the Gospel who have not left

<sup>1</sup> Ⲛ B D L X 12 Mnn. Italic Vulg. Syr<sup>sch</sup> Orig. read *οτι ουκ* instead of *ου γαρ*.

<sup>2</sup> Ⲛ B K L M Π some Mnn. Italic Vulg. Cop. omit the words *καθως ειπων υμιν* which are supported by 12 Mjj., nearly all the Mnn. Italic Syr.; some Mnn. and Vss. repeat them: "As I said to you (ver. 26), Did I not say to you?" (ver. 27).

<sup>3</sup> *Gess* (p. 99) rightly sets forth the complete

agreement which is here manifest between John and the Synoptics. In these latter also Jesus, while accepting (in the conversation in Caesarea) the title of Christ from His disciples, forbids them to pronounce this word before the people. As in John, He desires the fact of faith, and not the word (Matt. xvi. 20 and parallels).

the scene." We have shown that Jesus had said this, and it is not difficult to show that He had said it to the same hearers. For the discourse in x. 1-18 had not been addressed, as Reuss asserts, to pilgrim strangers who had come to the feast of Tabernacles and afterwards had departed, but to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, in response to *some of the Pharisees* (ix. 40) who had asked: "*And are we also blind?*" No doubt, we cannot hold that it was identically the same individuals who were found there again after two months; but it was the same population all whose members were alike in their dependence on the rulers and their general hostility to Jesus. The essential aim of the following words, in which Jesus describes the privileges of His sheep, is certainly that of making His hearers feel what an abyss separates them from such a condition. Nevertheless this description naturally becomes an invitation to come to Him, addressed to those who are the least ill-disposed.

Vv. 27, 28. "*My sheep hear<sup>1</sup> my voice, and I know them; and they follow me* 28 *and I give to them eternal life; and they shall never perish and no one shall snatch them out of my hand.*" Luthardt has divided the six clauses of these verses into two groups of three: on one side, the faith of the believer, his personal union with the Lord, and the fidelity with which he persists in this union (ver. 27); on the other, the gift of life which Jesus makes, the salvation which He assures to him, and the divine protection which He causes him to enjoy (ver. 28). But this division into two groups does not accord with the two *καὶ*, and *I*, at the beginning of the second and fourth clauses. These two pronouns indicate a *repeated* reciprocity between the conduct of the believer and that of Jesus, and thus speak in favor of the division of Bengel, who divides into three groups of two: 1st pair: faith of the believer in the word preached ("*hear my voice*") and personal testimony of Christ given to the believer ("*I know them*"). 2d pair: practical fidelity of the believer thus known and loved ("*they follow me*"), and, on Christ's part, communication of the highest good, eternal life ("*I give them . . .*"). The 3d pair states the indestructible character of the salvation which the believer thus possesses ("*they shall never perish*"), and the cause of this certainty, the fidelity of Jesus which will preserve them from every enemy ("*no one shall seize them . . .*"). The first pair refers rather, like the first similitude, vv. 1-6, to the *formation* of the bond; the second, like the second similitude, vv. 7-10, to the life *in* this position; the third, like the picture, vv. 11-18, to the *indestructible* nature of this relation. The *hand* is here less the emblem of power, than that of property: "They shall not cease to be *mine*."

Vv. 29, 30. "*My<sup>2</sup> Father who has given<sup>3</sup> them to me, is greater<sup>4</sup> than all; and no one is able to snatch them out of my<sup>5</sup> Father's hand; 30 I and the*

<sup>1</sup> B L X Clem. Homil. ακουουσιν, instead of ακουει which is read by the T. R., with 14 Mj., etc.

<sup>2</sup> N Hlerique omit μου.

<sup>3</sup> B L It. Vulg. Cop. read ο δεδωκεν (*that which he has given me*), instead of ος δεδωκεν

(*he who has given me*) which is read by T. R. with 14 Mj. Syr. — D: ο δεδωκως.

<sup>4</sup> A B X It. Vulg. Cop.: μειζων, instead of μειζων which is read by T. R. with 15 Mj.

<sup>5</sup> B L Orig. reject μου.

*Father are one.*" We might be tempted to find, with *Luthardt*, a strict syllogism in the thoughts expressed in vv. 29, 30. Major: My Father is greater than all (ver. 29). Minor: I and my Father are one (ver. 30). Conclusion: Therefore I shall victoriously defend them against all (ver. 29). But, in general, the reasoning of Jesus tends rather to extend in a spiral manner than to close in upon itself like a circle. This is the case here: the sentiment rises and enlarges. Jesus begins by indicating the absolutely certain guaranty of His right of property in the sheep: God who has given them to Him is more powerful than all the forces of the universe. That any one should be able to wrest them from Him, it is necessary that He should begin by wresting them from God. Then, from this point, His thought rises still higher, even to the idea of the relation in virtue of which *everything* is common between the Father and the Son. We see in this gradation the filial consciousness displaying itself even till it has reached its utmost depth (ver. 30).

There are four principal readings in ver. 29: 1. That of the T. R. and the eleven less ancient Mj. (Γ Δ II etc.): ὁς and μεῖζων: "The Father *who* has given them to me is *greater* than all." 2. That of B. It. ὁ and μεῖζον: "That *which* the Father has given me is *greater* than all." 3. That of A and X: ὁς and μεῖζον: "The Father *who* has given them to me is something *greater* (neuter) than all." 4. That of κ L, ὁ and μεῖζον, which has really no meaning unless we consent to give a masculine attribute (μεῖζον) to a neuter subject ὁ ("what the Father . . ."). It is the same with the third, in which the subject is masculine and the attribute neuter. How could God be represented as a *thing*? Finally, one must be singularly blinded by prejudice in favor of the text of B, to prefer, as *Tischendorf* and *Westcott* and *Hort* do, the second reading to the first. Not only do the ordinary documents of the Alexandrian text contradict one another; but the sense which is offered by the reading of the *Vatican MS.* has not the least internal probability. John would say, according to that reading, that *what the Father has given* to Jesus is *greater* than all or everything. It would thus be the flock of Jesus which is here called greater, in the sense of more precious, more excellent than all. But what a strange expression! Believers are of more value than the whole universe, perchance. But the Scriptures never express themselves in this way. They glorify God, not men, even the most faithful men. Moreover, the expressions: *no one shall snatch them* (ver. 28), *no one can snatch them* (ver. 29), show that the point in hand is a comparison of power, not between the *sheep* and their enemies, but between *God Himself* and these enemies. So *Luthardt*, *Weiss* and *Keil*, in this case, give up the reading against which we are contending. The following is the way in which these variants may have arisen. Offense may have been taken at seeing δέδωκε, *has given*, without an object, and, through a recalling of the expression in vi. 37, 39 (*that which the Father gives me, has given me*) and xvii. 3 (*that which thou hast given me*), the copyists may have changed ὁς (who) into ὁ (*that which*) and made ὁ πατήρ, the Father, the subject of *has given*. The transformation of μεῖζων into μεῖζον was the inevitable consequence of the first

change. The other readings are mixtures resulting from the embarrassment in which the subsequent copyists found themselves.

The *hand*, when the Father is in question, represents power rather than possession. God has transmitted this to the Son; but *His* power remains the safeguard of the property of the Son which is common to Him with the Fathers. Can this guaranty insure believers against the consequences of their own unfaithfulness, as *Hengstenberg* asserts? The text says nothing like this. The question is of enemies from without, who seek to carry off the sheep, but not of unfaithfulness through which the sheep would themselves cease to be sheep.

According to *Weiss*, ver. 30 is intended to resolve the apparent contradiction between "guarded by my Father" and "guarded by me." I do not believe in this relation between ver. 30 and ver. 29, because in what precedes the idea of *guarding* has been in reality attributed only to God; the end of ver. 28 referred, as we have seen, to the right of property, not to the guarding of the sheep. Ver. 30 serves rather to explain why the Father inviolably guards that which belongs to the Son. It is because they have all things common, because they are *one*. If such is indeed the connection of ideas, ver. 30 cannot refer either to the unity of moral *will* (the Socinians), or of power (*Chrysostom* and many others, as *Lücke*, *de Wette*, etc.), or even solely to the community of action for the salvation of mankind (*Weiss*), as it has been described in vv. 19, 20, and in the sense in which Paul says, 1 Cor. iii. 9, of himself and Apollos: "He that planteth and he that watereth *are one* (*ἐν εἰσί*)," namely, as to the *end* which they propose to themselves in their work. Here the question is of the relation, not between two workmen, but between Christ as man and God. And if Jesus had only meant this, why did He not determine more clearly this notion of co-working, as Paul does in the following words (ver. 10), when he comes to speak of his relation to God: *We are God's fellow-workers?* Why above all give needlessly, and as it were wantonly, an offense to the Jews by employing an expression which appeared to say more than what He in reality meant to say? No, Jesus neither meant: "We *desire one* and the same thing," nor "We have the same *power*," nor, "We labor in the same *work*." In saying "We are *one*," He has affirmed a more profound unity, that which is the inner and hidden basis of all the preceding statements and which Jesus here allows to break forth, as in viii. 58 He had suffered the deepest foundation of His personal existence to show itself. *Reuss*, being altogether indifferent to the question, since he ascribes the discourses of John to the evangelist, recognizes without hesitation the true meaning of this verse: "The filial relation here, as throughout the whole book, is not only that of love or of the community of will and of action (the ethical relation), but also that of a community of nature and essence (the metaphysical relation)." The term *one* expresses the consciousness of union, not only moral but essential, with God Himself; the expression *we are* establishes the difference of persons. As to *we*, it would be in itself alone a blasphemy in the mouth of a creature; God and I, *we* (comp. xiv. 23)!<sup>1</sup> It has been objected that the

<sup>1</sup>The minister of state, Thiers, who allowed himself one day to say: "The king and I,

expression: *to be one*, is elsewhere applied to the relation between Jesus and believers, which would prove that it has a purely moral sense. But the union of Jesus and believers is not a mere agreement of will; it is a consubstantial union. The incarnation has established between Jesus and ourselves a relation of nature, and this relation embraces henceforth our entire personality, physical and moral.

Ver. 31. "*The Jews therefore*<sup>1</sup> *brought stones again to stone him.*" Οὖν, *therefore*, by reason of the blasphemy (ver. 30); comp. ver. 33. *Weiss* claims that, even understanding the words of ver. 30 in the sense which he gives to them, the Jews may have found therein a blasphemy. But, taken in the sense of a common action of God and Jesus, this thought certainly did not go beyond what in their view the Christ might legitimately say. But they had just asked Him whether He was the Christ. What was there in it, then, which could so violently offend them? Πάλιν, *again*, alludes to viii. 59. Only ἦραν, *they took up*, was used in the former case, while John now says ἐβάστασαν, *they brought*. Probably they did not have the stones at hand in the porch; it was necessary to go some distance to find them in the court. There was here, no longer a mere demonstration, as in chap. viii., but a serious attempt. The question was of accomplishing at length the act of stoning, which had several times been threatened. Shades of expression like this reveal the eye-witness, whose eyes followed anxiously this progress of hatred.

### III.—Second address: v. 32-39.

The reply of Jesus treats of two subjects: 1. That of the *blasphemy* which is imputed to Him (vv. 32-36); 2. That of His *relation* to God which is contested (vv. 37-39).

Vv. 32-36: The accusation of blasphemy.

Vv. 32, 33. "*Jesus answered them: I have shown you many good works by the power of my*<sup>2</sup> *Father; for which of these works do you stone me?*" 33. *The Jews answered him*<sup>3</sup> *it is not for a good work that we stone thee, but for blasphemy, and*<sup>4</sup> *because, being a man, thou makest thyself God.*" This time Jesus does not withdraw, as in viii. 59; He makes the stones fall from the hands of His adversaries by a question. Instead of *good works*, the translation should properly be *beautiful works* (*Rilliet*). The epithet *καλά* designates indeed not the beneficent character of the works, but their moral beauty, their perfection in holiness, in power, as well as in goodness. The term *ἔδειξα*, strictly, *I have shown*, characterizes these works as grand specimens of all those which the Father holds in reserve, and as the sensible and glorious proofs of the favor which the Son enjoys with Him. The Father shows Him these works in the ideal sphere (v. 19, 20), and He shows them to the world in the sphere of reality. The preposition *ἐκ* indicates that the will and power by which Jesus accomplishes these works pro-

we . . ." provoked a smile in the whole Chamber; what would the creature deserve who should venture to include himself with God Himself in the pronoun *we*?

<sup>1</sup> Οὖν (*therefore*) is wanting in  $\aleph$  B L It<sup>alg</sup>.

<sup>2</sup>  $\aleph$  B D reject *μου*.

<sup>3</sup> T. R. adds *λεγοντες* (*saying*), with 9 Mj. (D E G etc.) against 8 Mj. ( $\aleph$  A B etc.) 20 Mn. It. Vulg. Syr.

<sup>4</sup>  $\aleph$  omits *και* (*and*).

ceed from the Father (v. 36). The question of Jesus contains a keen irony, an expression of the deepest indignation. Undoubtedly, the ground on which the Jews intended to stone Him was not that which Jesus here ascribes to them; but in alleging another ground they imposed upon their consciences, and Jesus reveals to them the true condition of things by means of this question. Was it not on occasion of the healing of the impotent man that their murderous hatred had first manifested itself (chap. v.)? Had it not been increased in violence by the healing of the man born blind (chap. ix.)? And will it not be a third miracle, the resurrection of Lazarus (chap. xi.), which will bring it to its fatal limit? Jesus knew this full well: it was these great and beautiful works which, by marking Him as the Son, caused Him to be the object of their fury: "*This is the heir; let us kill him!*" Apart from this hatred, they would not so readily have accused Him, who was by His whole life glorifying God, of being a blasphemer. This question in a sense paralyzes them; Jesus is able to speak to them again.

The Jews formulate the point in dispute, in ver. 33, as it presents itself to their perverted consciences. The term: *a blasphemer*, expresses the general idea, and the following clause: *and because. . .*, specifies the charge, by applying it to the present case.

Vv. 34-36. "*Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your<sup>1</sup> law<sup>2</sup> I said ye are gods? 35. If it called them gods to whom the word of God was addressed, —and the Scripture cannot be broken,—36 do you say of him whom the Father has sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest! because I said, I am the Son of God?*"<sup>3</sup> This argument has often been presented as an implicit retraction of the expressions in which Jesus seemed to have affirmed His divine nature. In this sense, He is supposed to say: "Mere creatures have been called gods, because they represent God in some one of His functions, that of judge, for example; this is the only sense in which I have ascribed divinity to myself." But Jesus would thereby, at the same time, retract all His earlier testimonies, the meaning of which we have established. Jesus is occupied solely, in this first part of His reply, vv. 34-36, with repelling the accusation of *blasphemy*. With this end in view, He reasons as follows: "The Scripture called mere human beings gods, as being invested with an office in which they were the representatives and organs of God on earth; were I then nothing more than a mere man, sent to accomplish a divine work, I should not deserve, according to the Scripture itself, to be treated as a blasphemer for having called myself Son of God." As an argument *ad hominem* the reasoning is irrefutable. Nevertheless, it still leaves room for this objection: Jesus called Himself God in an altogether different sense from that in which the Scripture gave this title to the Israelite judges. But a second point is to be observed here: it is the gradation in vv. 35, 36: "If the Scripture did not blaspheme in calling the persons gods *to whom the revelation was addressed*, how can I have spoken blasphemy in declaring myself God, I, whom God sends into the world as *His revelation itself?*" This alto-

<sup>1</sup> N D It<sup>aliq</sup> omit *υμων*.

<sup>2</sup> N D E G: *θεου* instead of *του θεου*.

<sup>3</sup> N B D L X add *οτι* here.

gether different position of Jesus as regards the divine revelation justifies the higher sense in which He attributes to Himself the title of God. The monotheism of the Bible differs absolutely from the cold and dead Deism which Jewish orthodoxy had extracted from the sacred books, and which separates the Creator by a gulf from man. This petrified monotheism is the connecting link between degenerate Judaism, Mahometanism and modern rationalism; but it is only a gross caricature of the Scriptural conception. Every theocratic function exercised in the name of Jehovah, who has conferred it, places its depositary in living connection with the Most High, makes him participate in His inspiration, and constitutes him His agent. Thereby the man, king, judge or prophet, becomes relatively a manifestation of God Himself. "*At that time, the house of David shall be as Elohim, as the angel of the Lord.*" Zech. xii. 8. The Old Testament is, in its deepest tendency, in a constant advancing progress towards the incarnation, the crowning-point of the increasing approximation between God and man. This is the true basis of the reasoning of Jesus: If this entire course has nothing in it of blasphemy, the end in which it issues, the appearance of a man who declares Himself *one with God*, has in itself nothing in contempt of the majesty of God.

The quotation is derived from Ps. lxxxii. 6; and the term *law* denotes here, as in vii. 49, xii. 34, etc., the entire Old Testament, not as a denomination *a potiori parte*, but rather inasmuch as this whole book formed a law for the Israelitish thought and life. On the expression *your law*, see on viii. 17. Asaph, in this Psalm, addresses the theocratic judges. Ver. 1 describes their greatness, in virtue of their function as organs of the divine justice, which has been intrusted to them. God Himself sits in the midst of them; it is from Him that their judgments emanate. Then in vv. 2-5, Asaph contrasts the sad reality, the injustice of the actual judges, with the ideal greatness of their function. In ver. 6, he returns to the idea of the first verse, that of their official dignity. The words: *I said*, refer undoubtedly to the expression of Asaph himself in ver. 1: "*God is present in the congregation of God.*" And thus he prepares for the transition to the warning of vv. 7, 8, in which he reminds them that they will themselves be one day judged, for an account will be demanded of them respecting this divine function with which they had been clothed. Jesus draws from the words of the Psalmist a conclusion *a minori ad majus*, precisely as in vii. 23. The basis of the reasoning is the admitted principle: that the Scriptures cannot blaspheme. By *those to whom the word of God is addressed*, Jesus evidently understands those judges, to whom the Holy Spirit addresses Himself, saying: *You are . . .* The parenthetical remark: *And the Scripture cannot be broken*, shows the unlimited respect which Jesus feels for the word of Scripture.

Let us suppose that it was the evangelist who invented all this argument; could he, the so-called author of the theory of the Logos, have resisted the temptation to put into the mouth of Jesus here this favorite title by which he had designated Him in the Prologue? This would be the altogether natural gradation: The law calls them judges to whom the

*Word* is addressed; how much less can I be accused of blasphemy, who am *the Word* itself, when I attribute to myself the title of God! John does not yield to this temptation; it is because it did not exist for him, since he limited himself to giving a faithful report of what his Master had said. Jesus designates Himself as *Him whom the Father has sanctified and sent*. The first expression might strictly refer to a fact in the earthly life of Jesus, such as that of the miraculous birth (*Luthardt*) or that of the baptism (*Weiss*). But in that case it would be necessary to refer the following expression: *sent into the world*, to an act later than the one or the other of these two events: according to *Weiss*, for example, to the command to begin His *public* ministry. Or it would be necessary to admit a retrograde order in the position of the two terms *sanctify* and *send*, which is quite as unnatural. The term *to send into the world* can of course only designate the mission which He received when He came from God to fulfill His work as Redeemer; and the term *to sanctify* must consequently designate the celestial act by which God specially set Him apart and consecrated Him for this mission. It was to this commandment, previous to the incarnation, that we were already referred by the expression *commandment, ἐντολή*, used in v. 18; comp. 1 Pet. i. 20. There was a consulting together between the Father and the Son before the coming of Jesus to the world, of which He Himself formulates the result when He says: "*I am come down from heaven, not to do my own will, but the will of him who sent me*" (vi. 38). How great is the superiority of such a being to all those to whom the divine revelation addresses itself here below! In reproducing the charge alleged against Him, Jesus passes to the direct discourse: *Thou blasphemest*. It is the lively repetition of the accusation, as it was still sounding in His ears. The following words: *because I said*, depend not on *thou blasphemest*, but on *you say*. The title *Son of God* evidently here reproduces the substance of the declaration of ver. 30: *I and my Father are one*. This example shows again how erroneous it is to see in the title *Son of God* the indication of a function, even of the highest theocratic function. Taken in this sense, this term does not involve absolutely any blasphemy at all. These Jews who had just addressed to Him the question: "If thou art the Christ, tell us plainly," evidently could not have found in this title of Christ a blasphemy. And, as for Jesus, He is here thinking, as ver. 30 shows, on something altogether different from His dignity as Messiah. That is only a corollary following from His altogether peculiar union with God. He is only endeavoring therefore to awaken in the hearts of His hearers the feeling of His close relation to God, being certain, not only that the conviction of His Messiahship will naturally result from it, but also that in this way only that idea will not be erroneously conceived. Hence what follows:

Vv. 37-39: The proof of the divinity of Jesus.

Vv. 37-38. "*If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not; 38 but if I do them, though you believe not me, believe<sup>1</sup> my works, to the end that you*

<sup>1</sup> Readings: πιστεύετε (K B D, etc.) and πιστεύσατε (T. R. with A E G, etc.).

may know and may understand<sup>1</sup> that my Father is in me and I am in him." <sup>2</sup> There is much of gentleness in the manner in which Jesus here expresses Himself and reasons. He appeals with calmness from passion to sound reason. He consents that they should not believe on the ground of *the word*, although the testimony of a being like Himself ought to carry its proof in itself. But to His testimony there are united *the works* which the Father has accomplished through Him. If they have not ears, they have eyes; and what they do not infer from His words, they should, at least, infer from such works. The words: "If you do not believe *me*," mean: "If you do not accord belief to my personal affirmations." The reading of some Alexandrian authorities: *να γινώτε καὶ γινώσκητε*, seems to me the best one: "To the end that you may learn to know (*γινώτε*) and at last may understand (*γινώσκητε*)." These two terms taken together express the long and painful labor of that discovery which might have resulted from the first glance: "*Come and see*" (i. 47). The apparently pleonastic sense of this reading not having been understood by the copyists, they gave to the text the more common form which we find in the received reading: *to the end that you may understand and believe*. The words: *the Father in me, and I in the Father*, which indicate the contents of this obtained knowledge, recall the declaration of ver. 30 (*we are one*), but it does not follow from this, that, as *Weiss* will have it, it exhausts the sense of that declaration. It must not be forgotten that vv. 30 and 36 are the immediate expression of the contents of the consciousness of Jesus Himself, while ver. 38 formulates these contents only in the measure in which they can and should become the object of the moral apperception of believers. By beholding with the eye of faith, they will discover more and more clearly two things: the full communication which God makes of His riches to this human being, His organ on the earth (*the Father in me*); and the complete self-divesting by which Jesus, renouncing His own life, draws everything solely from the fullness of the Father and His gifts (*I in him*). This is the form in which faith can apprehend here below the unity of the Father and the Son. This relation is the *manifestation* of their essential unity, which Jesus had affirmed as the contents of His own consciousness.

Ver. 39. "*They sought therefore*<sup>3</sup> *again*<sup>4</sup> *to take him; but he went forth out of their hands.*" Perhaps this softened form in which Jesus had just repeated the affirmation of His divinity had had the effect of calming somewhat the irritation of His hearers; they abandon the purpose of immediately stoning Him. But, while they are plotting that they may arrest Him and bring Him to judgment, He succeeds in breaking the circle which they had formed around Him, and, after having rejoined His disciples, in leaving the temple with them. Nothing in the story leads to the supposition of a miracle.

<sup>1</sup> T. R. reads with 13 Mjj. (A Γ etc.) *πιστεύετε* (*that you may believe*); but B L X some Mnn. Cop. read *γινώσκητε* (*may understand*). N: *πιστεύετε*. D Itrierique omit the second verb.

<sup>2</sup> N B D L X read *εν τω πατρι*; T. R. with 12 Mjj.: *εν αυτω*.

<sup>3</sup> 9 Mjj. (B E G etc.) 40 Mnn. omit *ουν*.

<sup>4</sup> N D 10 Mnn. Itrierique Vulg. Cop. omit *πάλιν* (*again*).

It is absolutely impossible to suppose that a later writer, the inventor of the theory of the Logos, should have imagined an argument such as this passage contains. How could such a man have thought of ascribing to Jesus an argument which, superficially understood, seems to contradict everything which he had made Him affirm hitherto with relation to His divinity? This mode of discussion evidently bears the character of immediate historical reality. It testifies, at the same time, of the most lively understanding of the Old Testament. Evidently this whole discourse can be attributed only to Jesus Himself.

IV.—*Historical conclusion*: vv. 40–42.

Vv. 40–42. “*And he went away again beyond the Jordan, into the place<sup>1</sup> where John had baptized at the beginning;<sup>2</sup> and he abode there. 41. And many came to him, and they said: John did no miracle; but all that John said of this man was true. 42. And many believed on him there.*”<sup>3</sup> As we have already said, the Synoptics (Matt. xix. 1; Mark x. 1; and, because of the parallelism, Luke xviii. 15) also mention this sojourn in Peræa, a little before the last Passover. As Jesus certainly could not have remained a long time at Jerusalem without the result of bringing the conflict to its decisive issue, He abandoned the capital after the feast of Dedication, and went away to resume the pilgrimage which had been interrupted by this brief journey. It was thus that He arrived in Peræa, where we find Him in this passage of John. We feel, from the apostle’s tone, that this sojourn was not without pleasure for Jesus and for His first disciples. There is a charm in finding oneself, on finishing one’s career, in the places where it was begun. Jesus had, moreover, the joy of gathering a harvest here which had been prepared by the faithful labor of His forerunner. It would be difficult not to recognize in this description the personal recollection of the evangelist (see *Weiss*). The word *again* (ver. 40) does not by any means allude to a supposed sojourn in Peræa between vv. 21 and 22, as *Lange* thought, but certainly to that of which John had spoken in i. 28, when Jesus was at Bethany, near the Jordan, with His forerunner. The term τὸ πρῶτον (or, as the Sinaitic MS. reads, τὸ πρότερον) contrasts these first days with His later ministry, which was accomplished in altogether different localities (iii. 23). The meaning of the testimony which the believers of Peræa bear to Jesus is this: “If John did not himself do miracles, he did indeed at least predict everything which this one does, whose coming he announced.” John thus grew greater to their view with all the greatness of Him who had followed him and to whom he had borne testimony. The word *ἐκεῖ, there*, should certainly be placed, according to the reading of the Alexandrian authorities, at the end of the verse; it is on this word that the emphasis rests. This faith which is so easily developed in Peræa forms a striking contrast with the persistent and increasing unbelief of the inhabitants of Judea, which has just been described in the preceding chapters. This

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  omits the words εἰς τὸν τόπον.

<sup>2</sup> 10 Mj. ( $\aleph$  A B D, etc.) make ἐκεῖ the last word of the verse.

<sup>3</sup>  $\aleph$   $\Delta$ : τὸ πρότερον instead of τὸ πρῶτον.

passage thus forms, by means of this contrast, as *Luthardt* remarks, the last point of the great act of accusation directed against *the Jews* in this part of the Gospel.

### THIRD CYCLE.

#### XI. AND XII.

Everything is henceforth ripe for the catastrophe; the development begun in chap. v. reaches its utmost limit. Yet one more *good work*, and the condemnation of Jesus will be finally pronounced. Chap. xi. places us in the presence of this denouement.

Of the sojourn in Peræa the Synoptics relate to us some particular incidents which John omits; the conversation with the Pharisees respecting divorce, the presentation of the little children, the scene of the rich young man, the ambitious request of James and John. The fourth evangelist mentions only the fact which brings this sojourn to a close—the visit to Bethany.

It is evident that the point of view of the development of Jewish unbelief governed this selection; comp. the story of the session of the Sanhedrim, as the consequence of the miracle (vv. 47-53), the relation established between this miracle and the entrance into Jerusalem on Palm-day (xii. 17-18), and, finally, the relation between the latter and the final catastrophe (xii. 19).

The entire cycle is divided into three sections:

1. Chap. xi. : The resurrection of Lazarus, with its immediate result, the sentence of condemnation pronounced upon Jesus;
2. Chap. xii. 1-36 : Three events which form the transition from the active ministry of Jesus to His passion;
3. Chap. xii. 37-50 : A retrospective glance cast by the evangelist at the great fact of Jewish unbelief which has been described since chap. v. '

### FIRST SECTION.

#### XI. 1-57.

#### THE RESURRECTION OF LAZARUS.

No scene in this gospel is presented in so detailed and dramatic a manner. There is none from which appears more distinctly the character of Jesus as at once perfectly divine and perfectly human, and none which more fully justifies the central declaration of the Prologue: "The Word was made flesh."

- Three phases: 1. The preparation: vv. 1-16; 2. The event: vv. 17-44; 3. The consequence: vv. 45-57.

#### I.—*The preparation*: vv. 1-16.

John first describes the general situation, vv. 1, 2; then, the conduct of Jesus towards the two sisters, vv. 3-6; finally, His conversations with the disciples before departing, vv. 7-16.

Vv. 1, 2: "Now a certain man was sick, Lazarus, of Bethany, of the village of Mary and Martha, her sister. 2. Mary was she who anointed the Lord with ointment and wiped his feet with her hair; and it was her brother, Lazarus, who was sick." As it is the sickness of Lazarus which is the occasion of all that follows, the word ἀσθενῶν, *sick*, is placed at the beginning. The particle ὅς is the *now* of transition (v. 5). The name of the place where Lazarus lived is carefully noticed, because it is the situation of this village (in Judea) which occasions the following conversation between Jesus and His disciples. But how can the author designate Bethany as the village of *Mary and Martha*, two persons whose names have not yet been mentioned in this gospel. He evidently supposes that the two sisters are known to the readers through the evangelical tradition, especially through the fact related in Luke x. 38-42. *Bethany*, at the present day, *El-Azirich* (from *El-Azir*, the Arabian name of *Lazarus*) is a poor village situated on the eastern slope of the Mount of Olives, three-quarters of a league from Jerusalem, which is inhabited in our day by about forty Mussulman families. The supposed house of Lazarus, and also his sepulchre, have been pointed out since the fourth century, as they are still pointed out. The two prepositions, ἀπό and ἐκ, used here as parallel to each other, are not absolutely synonymous, as *Meyer* and *Weiss* think. The passage i. 45 does not prove anything in favor of this assertion. It seems to me that the first clause refers rather to the residence, the second to the origin: Lazarus lived at Bethany, *whence* he was. The name of Mary is placed first, as more conspicuous because of the fact mentioned in ver. 2. But it seems to follow from vv. 5, 19, that Martha was the eldest and from Luke x. 38 ff., that she was the principal personage in the house. The narratives in Matt. xxvi. 6 ff., and Mark xiv. 3 ff., prove that the oral tradition did not in general mention the name of Mary in the story of the anointing; for the expression there is simply *a woman*. And perhaps this omission may explain the form of the narrative of John in ver. 2: "This Mary, of whom I am here speaking to you, is the woman of whom it is related that she anointed . . . and wiped . . ." Through the closing part of the verse John returns from this episode to the fact which forms the subject of the narrative, by connecting the information to be given respecting Lazarus with the name of Mary as the last one mentioned: "*She it was whose brother, Lazarus, was sick.*"

*Hengstenberg* devoted twenty-six pages to the work of proving that (according to the idea which was generally prevalent before the Reformation) Mary, the sister of Lazarus, is the same person with Mary Magdalene (Luke viii. 2) and with the woman of sinful life who anointed the feet of Jesus (Luke vii. 36 ff.). He composes a little romance on this theme, according to which Galilee was the scene of Mary's dissolute life; Martha, her sister, in the course of a feast-journey, formed the acquaintance of the rich Pharisee Simon, a resident at Bethany, and married him; afterwards, she received into her house her sister Mary, who had abandoned her erroneous ways, and also her brother Lazarus, who had fallen into poverty. Thus we have an explanation of the entrance of Mary into the banqueting-room (Luke vii.); she was there, as it were, at home, and the attack of

Simon was the malicious bantering of a brother-in-law. There is nothing, even to the parable of the poor Lazarus and the wicked rich man, which may not in this way find its explanation, etc., etc. This dissertation proves only one thing; the facility with which a sagacious and learned man proves everything which he *wishes* to prove. The only argument which has any value is a certain resemblance in the expressions between John xi. 2 and Luke vii. 37, 38. But the scene is so different; on one side, Galilee; on the other, Judea; there, the first period of Jesus' ministry; here, one of the days which precede His Passion; there, a discussion as to the pardon of sins; here, a conversation on the sum expended; and the repetition of such homage is, according to the customs of the East, so natural, that we cannot accord the least probability to the double identity of persons which Hengstenberg seeks to establish.

Vv. 3, 4. "*The sisters therefore sent to Jesus to say to him, Lord, behold, he whom thou lovest is sick. 4. Jesus, having heard this, said: This sickness is not unto death; but it is for the glory of God, that<sup>1</sup> the Son of God may be glorified thereby.*" The message of the sisters is full of delicacy; this is the reason why the evangelist reproduces it as it came from their lips (*λεγονσαι, saying*). The address, *Lord*, alludes to the miraculous power of Jesus; the term *ιδε, behold*, to the impression which this unexpected announcement will not fail to produce upon Him; finally, the expression *ὃν φιλεῖς, he whom thou lovest*, to the tender affection which binds Jesus to Lazarus and makes it their duty not to leave Him in ignorance of the danger to which His friend is exposed. On the other hand, they do not insist; how could they press Him to come, knowing as they did the perils which await Him in Judea? They lay the case before Him: "Judge for thyself as to what must be done."

The words of Jesus (ver. 4) are not given as a reply to this message; the statement is: *he said*, not: *he answered*. They are a declaration which was directed as much to the disciples who were present, as to the absent sisters. The ever original and very often paradoxical character of the sayings of the Lord must be very imperfectly understood, if one imagines that He meant seriously to say that Lazarus would not die of this sickness, and that only afterwards, in consequence of a second message, which is assumed by the narrative, He recognized His mistake (ver. 14). No doubt, as *Lücke* observes, the glory of Jesus here on earth did not imply omniscience; but His moral purity excluded the affirmation of that of which He was ignorant. *Reuss* very fitly says: "Here is no medical statement." The expression which Jesus makes use of is amphibological; whether it contained an announcement of recovery, or a promise of resurrection, it signified to the disciples that the *final* result of the sickness would not be death (*οὐ πρὸς θάνατον*). *The glory of God* is the resplendence which is shed abroad in the hearts of men by the manifestation of His perfections, especially of His power acting in the service of His holiness or of His love. And what act could be more fitted to produce such an effect than the triumph of life over death? Comp. Rom. vi. 4. In ver.

<sup>1</sup> ἄ repeats ἀλλά before ἵνα.

40, Jesus reminds Martha of the saying which He here utters, in the words: "*Did I not say unto thee, that, if thou believest, thou shouldst see the glory of God?*" We may and should infer from this expression, that, at the moment when Jesus was speaking in this way, the death of Lazarus and his resurrection were already present events to His view. For the very grave terms: *for the glory of God, to the end that . . .*, indicate more than a mere miracle of healing (see *Keil*). We must therefore go back to this very moment in order to locate rightly the hearing of the prayer for which He gives thanks in ver. 42. This manifestation of divine power must also have shed its brightness over Him who was its agent. How can God be glorified in the person of His Son, without a participation on the part of the latter in His glory? *Iva, in order that*, does not therefore indicate a second purpose in juxtaposition with the one which had been previously indicated (*ὑπέρ*); it is the explanation of the means by which the latter will be attained. We see in this passage how far the meaning of the name *Son of God* passes, in the mouth of Jesus, beyond that of the title *Messiah*: it designates here, as in ver. 30, *the one who is so united with the Father* that the glory of the one is the glory of the other. The pronoun *δὲ αὐτῆς*, *by means of it*, may be referred to *the glory*; but it is more natural to refer it to *the sickness*. This saying recalls that of ix. 3; but it passes beyond it in greatness, in the same degree in which the resurrection of Lazarus surpasses in glory the healing of the one who was born blind.

Vv. 5-7. "*Now Jesus loved Martha and her sister and Lazarus. 6. When therefore he heard that he was sick, he remained yet two days in the place where he was; 7 then, when this time had passed, he says to the disciples, Let us go into Judea again.*"<sup>2</sup> It might be supposed that the remark introduced parenthetically into the narrative, in ver. 5, has as its purpose to prevent the idea that the delay of two days mentioned in ver. 6 arose from indifference. But the *οὖν*, *therefore*, of ver. 6, is opposed to this explanation. In order fully to understand the design of this remark, account must be taken of the *μέν* of ver. 6, which supposes a *δέ* understood in ver. 7: "*Jesus loved Martha and Mary . . . and Lazarus. . . . When therefore He heard of it, He remained, it is true (μέν); but, afterwards He said: Let us go . . .*" We perceive thus that the remark of ver. 5: *He loved*, refers not to the: *He remained*, of ver. 6, but to the order to *set out* given in ver. 7. This quite simple explanation does away with several forced suppositions, for example, that Jesus meant: *Although* Jesus loved, or this other: *Because* He loved, He remained, to the end of testing longer the faith of the two sisters. Jesus uses here the term of dignity, *ἀγαπᾶν*, instead of that of tenderness *φιλεῖν* (ver. 3), either, as the interpreters think, because the question is of the affection of Jesus for the two sisters—but would not the Lord's disciple be raised above such prepossessions?—or rather because the nobler term is better suited to the pen of the evangelist, while the expression of tenderness was more appropriate in the

<sup>1</sup> A D K Γ Δ A Π 20 Mnn. add *αυτου* after *μαθηταις*.

<sup>2</sup> N omits *παλιν*. A reads *πολιν* (*to the Jewish city*).

mouth of the sisters. Martha occupies here, as in ver. 19, the first place (see on ver. 1). *Bretschneider*, *Strauss* and *Baur* explain the two days' delay mentioned in ver. 6 by a personal motive on Jesus' part. He purposely desired to allow Lazarus to die, in order that He might have the opportunity, not only of healing him, but of raising him to life; these writers find here a proof of the non-authenticity of the narrative. But there is no allusion in the text to such an intention of Jesus; and even ver. 15: "*I rejoice for your sakes that I was not there,*" positively excludes it; for Jesus may well rejoice in a divine dispensation, but not in a thing which He had voluntarily and purposely caused. Moreover, it will appear from the sequel of the story that, at the moment when Jesus received the message of the sisters, Lazarus had already breathed his last. If indeed, counting backwards, we reckon the four days mentioned in vv. 17 and 39, which elapsed from the burial of Lazarus to the arrival of Jesus at Bethany, these days can only be as follows: the fourth and last is that in which Jesus makes the journey from Peræa to Bethany. From Bethany to Jericho is a journey of about six hours, and from Jericho to the Jordan of an hour and a half. It was therefore, in all, a journey of seven and a half or eight leagues from the Jordan, near the place where Jesus was, to Bethany; it might easily be made in one day. The second and third days are the two which Jesus passed in Peræa after having received the message of the sisters. Finally, the first is that in which the messenger arrived in Peræa to inform Jesus. It was therefore in the course of this day, a little while after the departure of the messenger, that Lazarus died, and also in the course of the same day that he was buried, according to the Jewish custom. Thus towards evening, when Jesus received the tidings of His friend's sickness, He was already in the tomb. We see clearly how erroneous is the reckoning of *Keim* who says (i., p. 495): "Three days were needed for Jesus to go from that region of Peræa to Bethany." *Meyer* is no less in error when he takes as the starting point of the four days which had elapsed since the burial of Lazarus (ver. 17) the day which followed the two days of waiting in Peræa. How could Jesus have taken three whole days for reaching Bethany from the Jordan? As to the reason which prevented Jesus from setting out on the journey immediately, it may be supposed, no doubt, with *Lücke* and *Neander*, that it was the work of His ministry in Peræa. But is it not better to say, with *Meyer*, that it was the waiting for the signal from the Father, by which Jesus always regulated His action? God might certainly act as Jesus, as a man, would not have done, and prolong the time of waiting with the design of making the miracle more manifest and more striking, with a view to the glory of His Son and His own glory.

Ver. 7. The *δέ* which should answer to the *μέν* of ver. 6 is omitted, as often in Greek, because the opposition which the *μέν* had in view gives place to the simple historical succession; see *Weiss*. The expression *ἔπειτα μετὰ τοῦτο*, literally: afterwards, after that, ver. 7, is not a pleonasm; it tells how long this waiting appeared both to the sisters and to Jesus Himself. It must be noticed that Jesus did not say: "Let us go to

Bethany," but "Let us go *into* Judea." It is an allusion to the peril which threatens Him in that country; by it He calls forth on the part of His disciples the expression of the feeling of apprehension which He knows to be in the depths of their hearts and which He wishes to overcome before starting on the journey. It is with the same purpose that He adds the word *πάλιν*, *again*, which reminds them of the dangers which He had just incurred during His last sojourn in Jerusalem. Meyer protests in vain against this intention; it appears clearly from the narrative.

Vv. 8-10. "*The disciples say to him; Master, the Jews were but now seeking to stone thee, and dost thou return thither? 9. Jesus answered, Are there not twelve hours in the day? If any one walk during the day, he does not stumble, because he sees the light of this world; 10 but if any one walk in the night, he stumbles, because the light is not in him.*" At the word Judea, as Jesus expected, the disciples uttered a protest. He took advantage of their objection to give them an excellent teaching with respect to their future ministry. The answer of Jesus (vv. 9, 10) has naturally a double meaning. The first meaning is clear: He who accomplishes the journey to which he is called during the twelve hours of the day, does not stumble; the light of the sun enlightens him and makes him discern the obstacles in his path; while he who wishes to continue his journey even after the night has come, is in danger of perishing. In the application, some give to the idea of *day* a purely moral sense. According to *Chrysostom, de Wette, Brückner* the day designates a virtuous life, a life passed in communion with God, and the sense is: On the line of duty marked out, one has no serious danger to fear; but as soon as one turns aside from it, he exposes himself to the danger of perishing. The sense is good; but the figure of the *twelve hours* is not explained. This last expression leads naturally to the *temporal* application of the idea of *day*. *Bengel, Meyer, Hengstenberg, Weiss* and *Reuss* have felt this. They understand by the *twelve hours of day* the divinely measured time of the *earthly life*: "The time which was granted me has not yet elapsed; so long as it continues, no one can injure me; but when it shall have elapsed, I shall fall into the hands of my enemies." So already *Apollinaris*, "The Lord declares that before the time of His Passion, the Jews could do nothing to Him: the day is the time until the Passion; the night, the time after the Passion." This sense seems to me incompatible with ver. 10, in which the term *προσκόπτειν*, *to stumble*, cannot designate a purely passive state, like that of Jesus falling into the hands of the Jews, and in which the expression: *There is no light in him*, cannot apply to Jesus. Meyer answers: "This is a point which pertains to the figure and which has no significance." But ver. 10, which forms half of the picture, cannot be treated in this way. I think (partly) with *Tholuck, Lange* and *Luthardt*, that the day here designates at once the *time* of life and the *task* assigned for this time; it is the day of the workman's labor, as in ix. 4. Only here the figure is borrowed from the situation in which Jesus finds Himself with His disciples. It is the morning; the sun rises; they have before them a good day's journey, twelve hours of daylight. During all this time, they will journey

without danger. Before it is night, they will have reached the end of the journey, Bethany. In the moral sense this means: "I can go without fear to Judea, whither duty calls me. The twelve hours which are granted me for the accomplishment of my task will remain intact. The sun of the divine will, in assigning me my task, enlightens my path; I shall not stumble. The danger of stumbling and falling would begin for me only at the moment when, fleeing in a cowardly way from a foreseen danger, I should wish arbitrarily to prolong the time of my life, and to add a thirteenth hour of walking to the twelve which legitimately belong to me. From that moment I could only stumble, sin, perish. For the hour of life which God had not given me, would be an hour without duty or mission; the sun of the divine will would no more enlighten my course." In other terms: "The Jews cannot take away from me one moment of the time which is accorded me, so long as I am in the accomplishment of my task; a real danger will assail me only if, as you would have me do, I seek arbitrarily to prolong my career, by refusing to go whither duty calls me." This word applies to the believer who, in the time of persecution, would prolong his life by denying his faith, to the physician who would flee from the approach of a contagious malady, etc. The man, after being placed in such a situation, can only sin and perish. *Meyer* objects to this sense, that the disciples asked Jesus only not to shorten His life, and did not ask Him to prolong it. But this amounts to precisely the same thing. To desert duty for fear of shortening one's life, is not this to strive to prolong it beyond due measure? The expression: *the light is not in him*, signifies that the divine will, no longer presiding over that life, cannot serve to direct it; such a man lives only on a venture, because he ought not to live any longer. The parallel 1 John ii. 10, 11, confirms this meaning. The analogy of the expressions and ideas between the two passages is remarkable. John there applies to the believer who loves or does not love his brother what Jesus here says of the man who is obedient or not obedient to the will of God. This saying is, both in matter and form, the counterpart of that in which Jesus gave the reason, ix. 4, of the act of healing the man who was born blind. Only, according to the fine remark of *Lange*, there it was evening; He saw the sun descending to the horizon: "I must not *lose* a moment of the time which remains for me to enlighten the world." Here it is morning: "The time which is assigned me is sufficient for accomplishing my whole task; I must not through cowardice seek to *add* an hour to the day of work which is divinely assured to me." In these two words: to lose nothing, to add nothing, is certainly summed up the duty of man in relation to the time of his earthly work.

Vv. 11-13. "*He spoke thus, and after this he says to them, Lazarus, our friend, sleeps; but I go to awaken him. 12. Whereupon they said to him: 'Lord, if he sleeps, he will recover. 13. But Jesus had spoken of his death, and*

<sup>1</sup> T. R. reads εἶπον οὐν οἱ μαθ. αὐτοῦ with 10 Mj. the Mm. It<sup>pl</sup>ε<sup>qu</sup>-Vulg. ⚭ B C D K X read αὐτῶ either before or after οἱ μαθ., and reject

αὐτοῦ. A and 1 Mn., which Tischendorf follows, reject οἱ μαθ. αὐτοῦ and read αὐτῶ.

they thought that he was speaking of the rest of sleep." The words *ταῦτα εἶπε*, he spoke thus, and . . . , are not superfluous. They signify that this general maxim which He had just stated was applied by Him on the spot to the present case. *Weiss* wrongly asserts that this application is not found in what follows. It is in the words: *I go to awaken him*. The epithet: *our friend*, appeals to their affection for Lazarus, just as the expression: *he whom thou lovest*, in ver. 3, had made an appeal to His own friendship for him. Some interpreters have thought that it was at this moment that, either through a new message (*Neander*); or through His prophetic consciousness (*Weiss*), Jesus Himself learned of the death of Lazarus. But the promise of ver. 4 has proved to us that He had known this circumstance in a supernatural way, from the moment when the message of the two sisters had drawn his attention to the condition of His friend. Jesus likes to present death under the figure of sleep, a figure which makes it a phase of life.

*Strauss* found the misunderstanding of the disciples in ver. 12 inconceivable. *Reuss* calls it "a misapprehension which has precisely the import of that of Nicodemus." He adds: "Men do not ordinarily sleep several days in succession." But after having heard the words of ver. 4, it was natural that the disciples should not have believed in the possibility of the sick man's death. They might therefore think that this sleep of which Jesus was speaking was the crisis of convalescence, and that He wished to bring the sick man out of it healed by awaking him. It is very evident that, in their extreme desire not to go into Judea, they seek for a pretext, good or bad, for deterring Jesus from departing thitherward. In this situation, what improbability is there in this reply? The word *σωθήσεται* signifies here: will be healed of himself, without participation on thy part. The general term *κοίμησις* (*sleep*, ver. 13) is derived from *κεκοίμηται* (ver. 11), and must be determined here by a special complement (*τοῦ ὑπνου*).

Vv. 14-16. "Then Jesus therefore said to them openly, Lazarus is dead; 15 and I rejoice for your sakes that I was not there, to the end that you may believe; but let us go to him: 16. Whereupon Thomas, who is called Didymus, said to his fellow-disciples, Let us also go, that we may die with him." After having set aside (vv. 9, 10), the motive alleged by the disciples against this journey, and indicated the reason (vv. 11, 12) which obliges Him to undertake it, Jesus concludes by explaining Himself and gives the order for departing. *ἡαρρησία*, as in xvi. 25: in strict terms, without figure. There would have been, as we have already seen, a manifest falseness in our Lord's expressing Himself, as He does in ver. 15, if this death had been the intentional effect of His own mode of action. The words: *to the end that you may believe* are the commentary on the limiting words: *for your sakes*. Undoubtedly the disciples were already believers; but, as *Hengstenberg* says, by growing, faith comes into being. At each new stage which it reaches, the preceding stage seems to it in itself nothing more than unbelief. Jesus knows how the increase of faith which is about to be produced in them around this tomb will be necessary for them, in a

little time, when they shall find themselves before that of their Master. There is something abrupt in the last words: *But let us go to him.* It is a matter of constraining them and of overcoming in them the last remnant of resistance. They yield, but not without making manifest the unbelief hidden in the depths of the hearts of some of them.

The words of Thomas to the other disciples betrays indeed more of love for the person of Jesus than of faith in the wisdom of His course of action. Their meaning is this: "If He actually desires to have Himself killed, let us go and perish with Him." The Thomas who speaks thus is indeed the same whom we shall meet again in xiv. 5, xx. 25; much of frankness and resolution, but little of disposition to subordinate the visible to the invisible. This quite undesigned consistency in the role of the secondary personages, is, as has been admirably brought out by *Luthardt*, one of the striking features of John's narrative and one of the best proofs of the historical truth of this work. The name *Thomas* (in the Aramaic תאומה, Hebrew תאומה) signifies *twin*. The name *Didymus*, which has in Greek the same meaning, was undoubtedly that by which this apostle was most commonly designated in the churches of Asia Minor, in the midst of which John wrote. Thus is the repetition of this translation in xx. 24 and xxi. 2 explained. *Hengstenberg*, *Luthardt*, and *Keil* see in this name of twin an allusion to the fact that Thomas carried in himself two men, a believer and an unbeliever, a Jacob and an Esau! He was a δίψυχος man (*Keil*)!

What wisdom and what love in the manner in which Jesus prepares His disciples for this journey which was so repugnant to their feeling! What elevation in the thoughts which He suggests to their hearts on this occasion! What grace and appropriateness in the images by which He endeavors to make these thoughts intelligible to them!

## II.—*The Miracle*: vv. 17-44.

### 1. Jesus and Martha: vv. 17-27.

Vv. 17-19. "*Jesus on his arrival found that he had been in the tomb four days already.* 18. *Now Bethany was near to Jerusalem, at the distance of about fifteen furlongs;* 19 *and*<sup>1</sup> *many of the Jews had come to*<sup>2</sup> *Martha and Mary to console them concerning their brother's*<sup>3</sup> *death.*"—For the four days, see on ver. 6.—*Ἡμέρας* is objective, rather than circumstantial. See on v. 6. The expression: *He found*, marks the situation as it was according to the information given Him on His arrival. John sets forth the nearness of Bethany to Jerusalem, in order to explain the presence of such a large number of Jews (ver. 19). Fifteen stadia make a distance of about forty minutes. This distance is reckoned from Jerusalem as the starting-point, ἐγγὺς τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων; in this way the following proposition

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  A B C D L X: πολλοὶ δὲ instead of καὶ πολλοί.

<sup>2</sup> T. R. reads *πρὸς τὰς περὶ Μαρθᾶν κ. Μ.* with 12 Mj. (A. F, etc.), and nearly all the

Mnn., while  $\aleph$  B C D L X 4 Mnn. read *πρὸς (ὄτ πρὸς τὴν) Μαρθᾶν κ. Μ.*

<sup>3</sup>  $\aleph$  B D L omit *αὐτῶν*.

ἀπό is explained. The imperfect *was* refers to the part played by Bethany in this event which was already remote in time at the moment of John's writing. It is unnecessary to suppose that John is thinking of the destruction of this village in the Roman war. The turn of expression which is so common among the Greeks, *αὶ περὶ Μάρθαν* (ver. 19), is removed by the Alexandrian reading, but wrongly, even according to *Meyer* and *Tischendorf*. It occurs again twice in the New Testament (Acts xiii. 13, xxi. 8). That it was introduced here by the copyists seems to me very questionable. This form of expression points to Martha and Mary as surrounded by the servants of their household; it implies that the two sisters were in easy circumstances. It is commonly inferred from 1 Sam. xxxi. 13 and 1 Chron. x. 12, that the ceremonies of condolence continued for eight days; but the question in those passages is of royal personages. The passages cited by *Lightfoot* (pp. 1070 ff.) also seem to me insufficient to prove this usage. The sequel proves that the term *Jews* which is here used preserves the unfavorable sense which it has throughout this entire Gospel. Notwithstanding the fact that Martha and Mary were closely connected with these persons, they yet mostly belonged to the party hostile to Jesus. This point is mentioned in order to make prominent the change of feeling which was produced in a certain number of them (vv. 36-45).

Vv. 20-24. "When Martha heard that Jesus was coming, she went out to meet him; but Mary still sat in the house. 21. Martha therefore said to Jesus: Lord,<sup>1</sup> if thou hadst been here, my brother would not have died; <sup>2</sup> 22 And<sup>3</sup> even now, I know that whatsoever thou shalt ask of God, God will give it thee. 23. Jesus says to her, Thy brother shall rise again. 24. Martha says to him, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection, at the last day." Martha, no doubt occupied with her household affairs, was the first to receive the news of the Lord's arrival, and, in her eagerness, she ran to meet Him, without the thought of telling her sister, whose grief was keeping her in the inner apartment. Such as the two sisters are represented to us in Luke x. 38 ff., such precisely we find them again here. The narrative of John seems even to allude to that of his predecessor. On the opposite supposition, the harmony in the characters is only the more striking. The words of Martha (ver. 21) are not a reproach. How could she be ignorant that her brother was dead even before Jesus had received the news of his sickness? How, especially, could she allow herself to complain of His mode of acting, at the very moment when she is about to ask of Him the greatest of gifts? She simply expresses her regret that Jesus had not been there at the time of the sickness, and this regret serves only to prepare the way for the request which she has to make. She says, according to the T. R. and the Byzantine authorities: οὐκ ἔτεθνήκει, "would not be at this moment sunk in death," instead of ἀπέθανεν, "would not have gone through the act of dying," which is read by the Alexandrian authorities (see on ver. 32).

<sup>1</sup> B omits κυριε (Lord).

<sup>2</sup> Instead of ετεθνηκει which is read by A E F G H M S U T Δ A nearly all the Mss.,

απεθανεν is read in N B C D K L X II.

<sup>3</sup> N B C X reject the αλλα (but) of the T. R. before και νυν.

The T. R. adds, with several Mss., *ἀλλά* before *καὶ νῦν*: "but even now." This *but* is unnecessary: "I know that even now in his death my brother can experience the virtue of Thy prayer." The indefinite expression *whatsoever* leaves that to be understood which is too great to be expressed. There is an evident reserve of delicacy in this indirect request. It is no doubt the greatness of the work expected which is expressed in the repetition of the word *θεός*, *God*, at the end of the two clauses of ver. 22: "Thou art the well-beloved of *God*, *God* will give Thee the life of my brother." This confidence is inspired in Martha not only by the general knowledge which she has of Jesus and by the resurrections which had been effected in Galilee, but more especially by the message of ver. 4, and by this sudden arrival, which involved in itself also a promise.

There is in Martha's faith more of vivacity than of light. She believes in the miracle of power; but she is not yet initiated into the spiritual sphere within which alone such an act will assume its true meaning and value. Before satisfying her request, Jesus endeavors to put her into a condition to receive it. He proceeds, with this end in view, as He did in chaps. v. and vi., by giving to His promise at first the most general form: *Thy brother shall rise again*. Hengstenberg even supposes that He makes no allusion in these words to the approaching resurrection of Lazarus, which, according to him, does not deserve the name of a resurrection. For the return to this wretched earthly existence cannot be called by this fair name. But is it not doing violence to the text, to refuse to see in these words the promise of the event which is to follow? The belief in the resurrection of the pious Israelites, as the opening act of the Messianic kingdom, had been already announced in Dan. xii. 2 and 2 Macc. vii. 9, 14, etc.; it was generally spread abroad in Israel, and that especially "in the circles in which the Pharisaic teaching prevailed."<sup>1</sup>

There is not by any means, in the answer of Martha, an indication, as has been supposed, of a fall from the height of faith to which her heart had been raised. Only, in speaking thus, she wishes to assure herself of the meaning which Jesus Himself attaches to His promise. If she speaks only of the *final* resurrection which is to her mind certain, it is that she may give to Jesus the opportunity to explain Himself, and to declare expressly what she scarcely dares to hope for in the present case. There is as it were an indirect question here. Everything in Martha breathes a masculine faith, full of energy and activity. But this faith is not as spiritual as it is strong; it has not yet in a sufficient degree the person of the Lord as its object. Jesus, on His part, endeavors, in His reply, to develop it in this direction.

Vv. 25, 26, "*Jesus said to her, I am the resurrection and the life; he that believes on me, even though he were dead, yet shall he live; 26 and whosoever lives and believes on me shall never die; believest thou this?*" Martha has just spoken of the resurrection as of a future *event*; Jesus sets in opposition to

<sup>1</sup> Schürer, *Neutest. Zeitgesch.*, p. 395 ff. The differences which existed in the matter of

this general expectation of the resurrection are completely set forth by this author.

this event *His person* (ἐγώ, I; εἰμι, I am), as being in reality the resurrection. Victory over death is not a physical fact; it is a moral work, a personal act; it is *the doing* of Jesus Himself (v. 28, 29: vi. 39, 40, 44); and consequently He can accomplish it when he pleases, to-day even, if He wishes, as well as after the passing of ages. Jesus thus brings back the thought of Martha to Himself and gives to her faith its true object. He substitutes for adherence to dogmatic truth confidence in His person. This is what He had also done in chaps. iv. and vi., where, after some moments of conversation, He had substituted Himself for the abstract notions of living water and bread from heaven. After having declared Himself to be the resurrection, Jesus proclaims Himself as *the life*. It might be supposed that He means to speak of the glorious and perfect life which follows the resurrection. But according to the explanation which follows (vv. 25, 26), it is better to hold, with *Luthardt*, that Jesus passes from the outward resurrection to the more profound fact which is its spiritual *condition*. If He is the principle of the physical resurrection, it is because He is that of *life* in the most exalted sense of that word (v. 26, vi. 51). The spiritual life which He communicates to His own is for them, if they are dead, the pledge of a return to corporeal life; and, on the other hand, while still living, they are raised by it above the passing accident of physical death. The first declaration applies to Lazarus and to the other believers who were already dead. In virtue of the new life which they have received by faith, they continue living, and consequently they may, at the moment when Jesus wills, be recalled to corporeal existence. The second declaration (ver. 26) applies to the two sisters and to all the believers who were still living; they remain sheltered from death; for to die in full light, in the serene brightness of the life which is in Jesus, and to continue to live in Him (ver. 25) is no more the fact which human language has designated by the name of death (see on vi. 50, viii. 51). Jesus means therefore: In me the dead lives, and the living does not die. The terms *to die*, in the first clause, and *to live*, in the second, are to be taken in the strict sense.

This saying, by carrying the thought of Martha from the momentary and corporeal fact of the resurrection to its spiritual and permanent principle, gives to the person of Christ its true place in the miracle, and to the miracle its true religious significance. The resurrection of her brother becomes for her as-if an emanation of the life of Jesus Himself, a ray of His glory, and thus the means of uniting the soul of Martha to Him, the source of life. *Reuss* sees in this answer of Jesus a means of setting aside the popular idea of the corporeal resurrection, or at least of divesting it of all theological value. One must be singularly preoccupied by his own theory to draw from this reply a conclusion which is so foreign to the context and so contrary to the perfectly free and clear affirmation of v. 28, 29. Jesus thus returned to the subject from which Martha had turned aside, the resurrection of Lazarus. Before acting, He asks her further: "*Believest thou this?*"

Ver. 27. "*She says to him, Yes, Lord, I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, who was to come into the world.*" To see in this confession of

Martha, as some have done, only a simple avowal of a want of understanding with reference to the preceding words of Jesus: "I do not comprehend all these profound things of which thou art speaking to me, but I hold thee to be the Messiah," is strangely to depreciate its significance. This meaning would give to this scene which is of so grave import a character almost ridiculous. By her answer: *Yes, Lord*, Martha certainly appropriates to herself all that which Jesus has just affirmed respecting His person. Only, she does not feel herself in a condition to formulate spontaneously her faith in the things which are so new for her, and she makes use of terms which are familiar to her in order to express the thought that Jesus is to her all that which is greatest, and that, whatever He may affirm respecting His person, He will never say too much for the faith of her who speaks to Him. *The Christ*: the end of the theocratic revelations and dispensations; *the Son of God*: evidently something else than *the Christ*, unless there is an idle tautology here: the personage in whom God manifests Himself as in no other, and who is in an intimate and mysterious relation with God. The expression: *who comes into the world*, is not a third title, but an apposition explanatory of the two others. The present participle ἐρχόμενος, *who comes*, is the present of idea: the one who, according to the divine promise, should come, and in fact comes. *The world*: the foreseen theatre of his Messianic activity. There is a great psychological truth in this reply of Martha: by designating Him thus, she implicitly acknowledges that He is indeed all that which He has said: *the resurrection and the life*.—Εγώ: *I* whom thou art questioning; *πεπίστευκα* (perfect): this is a conviction which I have gained.

2. Jesus and Mary: vv. 28-37.

Vv. 28-30. "*And having said this,<sup>1</sup> she went away and called Mary, her sister, secretly, saying, The Master is here and calls thee. 29. She, as soon as she heard this, rises<sup>2</sup> directly and comes<sup>3</sup> to him. 30. Now, Jesus was not yet come into the village, but was still<sup>4</sup> in the place where Martha had met him.*" The words: *He calls thee*, are sufficient to prove that Jesus had indeed given this commission to Martha. He must have desired to prepare Mary, as He had prepared her sister; the miracle could not be really beneficial to the one or the other except on this condition. Very probably, though *Weiss* does not admit this idea, the precaution which Martha takes in discharging His message (*λάθρα, secretly*) had been recommended to her by Jesus; He had heard how Mary was surrounded; and, if He did not flee from danger, no more did He seek it (see on ver. 30).

The liveliness of Mary's emotion on hearing this message is pictured in the verbs in the present tense: *ἐγείρεται, she rises*, and *έρχεται, she comes*. This reading, indeed, is preferable to the Alexandrian readings *ήγέρθη* and *ήρχετο, she rose and she came*, as in this case *Tischendorf* and *Weiss* acknowl-

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  B C L X: *τοῦτο* instead of *ταῦτα*, which is read in the 14 other Mj. nearly all the Mm. It. Vulg. Syr.

<sup>2</sup>  $\aleph$  B C D L X It. Sch.: *ηγέρθη* (*rose*) instead of *εγείρεται*.

<sup>3</sup> The same (except D): *ηρχετο* (*came*) instead of *ερχεται*.

<sup>4</sup>  $\aleph$  B C X It. Vulg. Cop.: *ην ετι* (*was still*) instead of *ην* (*was*).

edge, who think that the aorist and imperfect were substituted for the present under the influence of the preceding ἤκουσεν, *she heard*. The Alexandrian reading appears to me to have been formed under the influence of iv. 30; but there are not the same reasons for presenting in the picturesque form the arrival of Mary here, as that of the Samaritans in chap. iv. In these cases it is painful to see how the position taken by *Westcott* and *Hort* deadens their critical tact. Jesus had not entered into Bethany. This was not only because the tomb must necessarily have been outside of the village (*Luthardt*). There must have been some important reason which detained Him; otherwise He would have gone directly where His heart summoned Him, to the house of mourning. His purpose was undoubtedly to avoid everything which could attract attention; and the intention of the following verse is precisely to show how this design failed by reason of a will superior to His own, which had resolved to give to this miracle the greatest possible splendor. Jesus had done what He ought; God did what He wished. There happened here something like what is related in Matt. ix. 31; Mk. vii. 24, 36.

Vv. 31, 32. "*The Jews therefore who were with her in the house and were comforting her, when they saw that she rose up suddenly and went out, followed her, supposing<sup>1</sup> that she was going<sup>2</sup> to the tomb to weep there. 32. When therefore Mary had come to the place where Jesus was, and saw him, she fell at<sup>3</sup> his feet, saying to him, Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother<sup>4</sup> would not have died.*" One and the same thought had filled the soul of the two sisters and perhaps that of the dying man in his last hours: If Jesus were here! But on this common foundation of grief and regret some significant differences between the two sisters appear. We have remarked the masculine character of Martha's faith. Mary, on the contrary, seemed to be altogether overwhelmed by her grief: hers was a nature wholly feminine. And, like persons of vivid impressions, she makes no energetic effort to overcome the dejection which got the mastery of her. She lets herself fall at Jesus' feet, which Martha had not done; it is, moreover, the place which she loves (Luke x. 39; John xii. 3). She does not add to the expression of her grief, as does her sister, a word of faith and hope. There are, finally, in the exclamation which is common to her and Martha, two shades of difference which are not accidental. Instead of ἐτεθνῆκει, *he is dead* (the actual state), which the Byzantine authorities place in the mouth of Martha, ver. 21, she says: ἀπέθανε: he has done *the act* of dying; it is as if she were still at the cruel moment in which the separation was accomplished. This shade of difference in the received reading (ver. 27) speaks in favor of its authenticity. Then the pronoun μου, *of me*, is placed in the mouth of Mary before ὁ ἀδελφός, *the brother*, and even, according to the Alexandrian reading, before ἀπέθανε: a part of *herself*, as it were, is gone. Thus, in Martha, a nature practical and full of elasticity, capable of energetically reacting against a depressing feeling; in Mary, a

<sup>1</sup> Instead of λεγοντες (*saying*) which T. R. reads with 13 Mj. It. etc., κ B C D L X 7 Mm. Syr<sup>ob</sup> Cop. read δοξαντες (*thinking*).

<sup>2</sup> κ: οτι Ιησους υπαγει (*Jesus goes!*)

<sup>3</sup> κ B C D L X: προς instead of εις.

<sup>4</sup> κ B C L Δ place μου before απεθανε.

sensibility given up, without the least trace of reaction, to the feeling which absorbs her. What truth in every feature of this picture!

Jesus knows the human heart too well to attempt to apply to Mary the method which He has just employed with Martha. With a grief like hers, there is no need of teaching and speaking; there is need of sympathizing and acting.

Vv. 33, 34. "When therefore Jesus saw Mary weeping and the Jews who were with her weeping, he shuddered in his spirit and was troubled,<sup>1</sup> 34 and he said, Where have you laid him. They say unto him, Lord, come and see." The particle therefore establishes a relation of causality between the grief of Mary and those with her and the extraordinary emotion by which Jesus is seized at this moment. This relation is likewise indicated by the words: when He said, and by the repetition of the participle weeping, which, like a refrain, ends the two clauses. It is now generally acknowledged that the term ἐμπερικύβηται (from βριμάζειν, to neigh, to roar) can only designate a shudder of indignation. See the thorough demonstration in the essay of *Guntlich, Stud. u. Krit.*, 1862, pp. 260-269. This sense is applicable even to passages such as Matt. ix. 30, Mark i. 43, in which this word marks the stern tone of menace. We must set aside therefore, first of all, the meaning: to be seized with grief (*Lücke*), and to groan deeply (*Ewald*). But what can be the object of Jesus' indignation? According to *Chrysostom*, *Cyril*, and other Greek interpreters, this is the same emotion which He experiences on hearing the sobs and which He endeavors in vain to master. According to *Chrysostom*, τῷ πνεύματι, His spirit, designates the object of His indignation (He is indignant against His own spirit, that is to say, against the inward weakness which He feels), while *Cyril* sees in the Spirit the divine nature of Jesus reacting against His human nature; the same nearly, even at the present day, *Hilgenfeld*. The meaning given by *Chrysostom*, having very little naturalness in itself, would in any case require the use of ψυχή, the soul, instead of πνεῦμα, the spirit. For the soul is the seat of the natural emotions; comp. xii. 27; πνεῦμα, the spirit, designates the domain of the higher impressions appertaining to the relation of the soul to the divine. And if Jesus really struggled against a sympathetic emotion, how was it that He surrendered Himself to it the very next moment with perfect simplicity (ver. 35)? The explanation of *Cyril* tends to make the divine being and the human in Jesus two distinct personalities. *Meyer* and *Weiss* think that Jesus was indignant at the hypocritical tears of the Jews, which form a shocking contrast to the sincere grief of Mary. *Reuss* also inclines to this idea: Jesus revolts at the ostentation of this insincere grief. But the two participles weeping are in a relation of agreement, not of contrast. Others apply this movement of indignation to the want of faith which Jesus discerned at once in Mary and in the Jews (*Keim*, *Strauss*). But in the word weeping, twice repeated, the notion of grief is expressed, rather than that of unbelief; and a moment later, Jesus also weeps Himself! Some interpreters (*Calvin*, *Olshausen*, *Luthardt*, *Hengstenberg*, *Keil*) think

<sup>1</sup> D some Mss. Sah. : σταραχθη τῷ πνεύματι ὡς ἐμπερικύβηται.

that the indignation of Jesus is directed against the power of death and against Satan, the invisible enemy who wields this terrible weapon against men (viii. 44). It would be necessary to admit, with this explanation, that, while the indignation felt by Jesus (ver. 33), is directed towards the murderer, the tears which He sheds in ver. 35 are the expression of the pity with which the victims inspire Him. But how does it happen that nothing of a like nature manifests itself in Jesus in the other resurrections which He has effected? There must be in this case a peculiar circumstance which produces this altogether exceptional emotion. An analogous emotion is mentioned only in xiii. 21, at the moment when Jesus sees the treason of Judas in preparation: "*He was troubled in his spirit.*" The *spirit* is the seat of the religious emotions, as the *soul* is that of the natural affections. Thus in xii. 27, Jesus says: *My soul is troubled*, because the foreseeing of His sufferings makes His nature shudder, while here and in chap. xiii. it is in His *spirit* that He is agitated, because in both cases He sees Himself in immediate contact with evil in its blackest form, and because with a holy horror he feels the nearness of the invisible being who has taken possession of the heart of Judas, and (in our passage) of that of His declared enemies. This parallel throws light on the groaning of Jesus in ver. 33. On one side, the sobs which He hears around Him urge Him to accomplish the raising of His friend to life; but, on the other hand, He knows that to yield to this solicitation, and to cause the glory of the Father to break forth conspicuously at this moment, is to sign the sentence of His own death. For it is to drive to extremes His enemies and him who leads them to act. From the most glorious of His miracles they will draw a ground of condemnation against Him. A portion of these very persons whose sighs were pressing Him to act, will be among those who will cause Him to pay with His life for the crime of having vanquished death. Horror seizes Him at this thought; there is a diabolical perversity here which agitates His pure soul even to its lowest depths. We may recall the words of Jesus: "I have done many good works; for which do you stone me?" This is what is most directly referred to in these words. This agitation extended so far as to produce in Jesus an outward commotion, a physical trembling, expressed by the words: *He was troubled*. But the expression is chosen by the evangelist in such a way as to remove any idea of an unreasonable or merely passive agitation: the question therefore is not of a simple reaction of the moral on the physical with the purpose of restraining within Himself the impression produced upon Him (*Weiss*), or with that of preparing Himself by an energetic resolution for the conflict which He was about to engage in with the devil and with death (*Augustine, Calvin, Hengstenberg, Keil*). The Greek term can scarcely express such ideas. It seems to me that the physical agitation indicated by these words: *He was troubled*, is the mark of an energetic reaction by which Jesus, in some sort, threw off the emotion which had for a moment overpowered Him and recovered the full control of His being. This internal revolution terminated in this sudden and brief question: *Where have you laid hint?* The two *καί, and*, bring out

the intimate connection between these different emotions which succeed each other so rapidly within Him.

Vv. 35-37. "*Jesus wept.*" 36. *The Jews therefore said, Behold how he loved him.* 37. *But some of them said, could not he who opened the eyes of the blind, have caused that this man also should not have died ?*" The storm has passed; on approaching the tomb Jesus feels only a tender sympathy for the grief which had filled the heart of His friend at the moment of separation and for that which the two sisters had experienced at the same hour. The term *δακρύνειν*, to weep, does not indicate, like *κλαίειν* (ver. 33), sighs, but tears; it is the expression of a calm and gentle grief. *Baur* does not allow that one can weep over a friend whom one is to see again. This feature, according to him, proves the unauthenticity of the narrative. Assuredly, if this Gospel were, as he believes it to be, the product of speculative thought, this thirty-fifth verse would not be found in it; Jesus would raise His friend to life with the look of triumph and a buoyant heart, as the true Logos who had nothing human but the appearance of man. But the evangelist has said from the first: "The Word was made *flesh*," and he maintains the proposition with perfect consistency. "One does not raise the dead with a heart of stone," says *Hengstenberg*. Heb. ii. 17 teaches us that he who wishes to assist an unfortunate one, should, first of all, sink deeply into the feeling of the suffering from which he is about to save him. It is a strange fact that it is precisely the Gospel in which the divinity of Jesus is most strikingly affirmed, that leads us also best to know the profoundly human side of His life. The very criticism of the German savant proves how little such a Jesus is the child of speculation. The solemn brevity of the clauses in these verses, 34, 35, must be observed.

Even at the side of this tomb we find the inevitable division which takes place about the person of Jesus at each of His manifestations in acts or words. Among the Jews themselves there are a certain number whose hearts are moved at the sight of these tears; sympathy for misfortune is neutral ground, the purely human domain, on which all souls meet which are not completely hardened. But some among them find in these tears of Jesus a reason for suspecting His character. One of two things: either He did not have the friendship for *Lazarus* which he now affects to feel, or He did not really possess the miraculous power of which He claimed to have given the proof in the healing of the man born blind; in any case, there is something suspicious in His conduct. Some interpreters give a favorable meaning to this question of the Jews, ver. 37 (*Lücke, Tholuck, de Wette, Gumlich* and also, up to a certain point, *Keil*). But the evangelist identifies, by the very form of the expression (*some among them*), these Jews of ver. 37 with those of ver. 46. And with this sense it is not easy to understand the relation which can have existed between this question of the Jews and the new emotion of Jesus, ver. 38. *Strauss* finds it strange that these Jews do not appeal here to resurrec-

<sup>1</sup> N D some Mnn. read και (and) before εδακρυσεν.

tions of the dead which Jesus had accomplished in Galilee, rather than to the healing of the man born blind. But it is precisely an evangelist of the second century who would not have failed to put into the mouth of the Jews an allusion to these resurrections, which were at that time well-known throughout all the Church by the reading of the Synoptics. The historical fidelity of the narrative of John appears precisely from the fact that the inhabitants of Jerusalem appeal to the last striking miracle accomplished by Jesus in this very city and before their eyes. This healing had occasioned so many discussions and so many different judgments that it naturally presents itself to their thought.

### 3. Jesus and Lazarus: vv. 38-44.

Vv. 38, 39. "*Jesus therefore, shuddering in himself again, comes to the sepulchre; it was a cave and a stone was placed before it.* 39. *Jesus says, Take away the stone. The sister of the dead man<sup>1</sup> Martha, says to him, Lord, by this time he stinketh; for he has been dead four days.*" The new inward disturbance which Jesus feels is evidently called forth by the malevolent remark of the Jews (ver. 37); John himself gives us to understand this by the *therefore* (ver. 38). But this agitation seems to have been less profound than the first, and more readily overcome. This very natural detail is a new proof of the fidelity of the narrative.

The sepulchre was a cave dug in the rock, either horizontally or vertically. The verb *ἐπέκειτο* signifies, in the first case, that the stone was placed *before* the entrance of the cave; in the second, that it was placed *on* its opening. Numerous tombs are seen around Jerusalem both of the one form and the other. If the tomb which is shown at the present day as that of Lazarus, was really such, it was of the second sort. It is a cave hollowed out in the rock into which one descends by a narrow staircase of twenty-six steps. *Robinson* has proved the non-authenticity of the tradition on this point, as on many others. The stones by which these caves were closed might easily be removed; they were designed only to keep off wild beasts. There is between the second movement of indignation in Jesus and the decisive command: *Take away the stone*, a relation analogous to that which we have noticed between the first emotion of this kind and the question: *Where have you laid him?* We can easily imagine the state of expectation into which this question threw the whole company.

Did the remark of Martha (ver. 39), proceed, as some interpreters think, from a feeling of incredulity. But could she who hoped for the return of her brother to life before the promise of Jesus (vv. 22, 23), have doubted after such a declaration? This is impossible. By this remark she does not by any means wish to prevent the opening of the sepulchre; she simply expresses the anxiety which is caused in her mind by the painful sensation about to be experienced by Jesus and the spectators because of one who was so near and dear to her. As the dead man's *sister*, she feels

<sup>1</sup> The MSS. are divided between *τεθνηκotos* (T. R. with the Byzantines) and *τετελευτηκotos* (Σ A B C D K L II).

a kind of embarrassment and confusion. We must recall to mind how closely the idea of defilement was connected, among the Jews, with that of death and corruption. Here, therefore, is an exclamation dictated by a feeling of respect for Him to whom she is speaking: "Lord," and by a sort of delicacy for the person of him who is in question: *the sister of the dead man*. It has been thought (*Weiss, Keil*) that the affirmation of Martha: *by this time he stinketh*, was on her part only a supposition, since she justifies it logically by adding: *For he is there four days already*. But we must rather see in these words the declaration of a fact which she has herself ascertained by visiting the sepulchre; comp. ver. 31. The words: *For he is there . . . already*, indicate the cause, not the proof, of the fact which the care of the two sisters had not been able to prevent. This reflection, far from proving, as *Weiss* thinks, that Lazarus had not been embalmed, implies, on the contrary, that he had been, with all possible care, but only after the manner of the Jews. Among the Egyptians the entrails and everything which readily decays were removed, while among the Jews the embalming was limited to wrapping the body in perfumes, which could not long arrest corruption. The expectation of Jesus' arrival had certainly not prevented them, as some have supposed, from performing this ceremony. Does not ver. 44 show that Lazarus had his limbs enveloped with bandages like other dead persons (comp. xix. 40)? But even if Martha's remark did not arise from a feeling of incredulity, the fact indicated might nevertheless occasion in her a failing of faith at this decisive moment; so Jesus exhorts her to raise her faith to the whole height of the promise which He has made to her.

Vv. 40-42. "Jesus says to her, *Did I not say to thee, that if thou believest thou shalt see<sup>1</sup> the glory of God?* 41. *They took away the stone<sup>2</sup> therefore. And Jesus lifted up his eyes and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me.* 42. *As for myself, I knew indeed that thou dost always hear me; but I said it because of the multitude who surround me, that they may believe that thou didst send me."* Some interpreters refer the words: *Did I not say . . . ?* to the conversation in vv. 23-27. And it is certainly, indeed, to the expressions: *He who believes on me* (vv. 27 and 26), and *Believest thou this?* (ver. 27) that our thoughts are turned by the words of Jesus: *If thou believest . . .* But the characteristic expression of our verse: *the glory of God*, is wanting in these declarations, while it constitutes the salient feature of the promise of ver. 4. It is therefore this last promise that Jesus especially recalls to Martha. He well knew that it had been reported to the two sisters by the messenger; it had formed the starting-point of the conversation of vv. 23-27, which was only its confirmation and development. The *glory of God* is here, exactly as in Rom. vi. 4, the splendid triumph of the omnipotence of God, in the service of His love, over death and corruption (ver. 39). This is the magnificent spectacle

<sup>1</sup> Instead of *οφει* which is read by T. R. with K U F Π, 15 Mj. read *οψη*.

<sup>2</sup> Ⲛ B C D L X : *τον λιθον* (the stone) simply. T. R. adds, with 9 Mj. Byz. (E G H etc.), the

words *ου ην ο τεθνηκως κειμενος* (where the dead was laid); A K Π more briefly: *ου ην* (where he was).

which Jesus promises to Martha, and which He sets in opposition to the painful impressions which she apprehends for the bystanders and herself, when once the stone shall have been taken away. There is no reproach in the words: Did I not say . . . ? as if Martha were wanting in faith in speaking as she did. In the presence of the manifest signs of dissolution already commenced, Jesus exhorts her to a supreme act of faith, by giving her His promise as a support. She has already climbed the arduous slopes of the mountain; only one last summit to reach, and the spectacle of the glory of God, of life triumphant over death, will display itself to her eyes. Man would always see in order to believe; Martha is called to give an example of the opposite course: to believe in order to see. These words of Jesus do not imply that He makes the fulfillment of His promise depend, as *Meyer*, *Weiss* and others think, on Martha's faith. He is now decidedly pledged and cannot withdraw. What He subordinates to the supreme act of faith which He demands of her, is not the miracle, it is the joy which she will have from it ("see the glory"). The bodily eye beholds only the external wonder; but the divine love putting itself at the service of man to triumph over death—this is a spectacle which one beholds only with the eyes of the soul. It was the inner sense for beholding it which Jesus had endeavored to form in Martha in the conversation which He had just had with her; He must not lose, at the decisive moment, the fruit of this effort. The received reading: *the stone from the place where the dead was laid*, seems to be a paraphrase. The Alexandrian text reads briefly: *the stone*; see our translation. This reading, however, does not easily explain the origin of the other two. May not that of A K II: *the stone from the place where he was*, be the primitive text? Its brevity (*ὅτι ἦν*) explains, on one side, the Byzantine gloss, and, on the other, the omission, in the Alexandrian documents, of this explanatory clause. Jesus *lifts his eyes*: the visible heaven is for man the most eloquent witness of the invisible wealth and power of God. By penetrating with His look its infinite depths, Jesus seeks inwardly the face of the Father; what more human! it is indeed in reality the Word made flesh (comp. xvii. 1). The miracle is already accomplished to the view of Jesus; this is the reason why He renders thanks as if for a thing which is done: *Thou hadst heard me*. He thus confirms the view pronounced by Martha with relation to His miracles (ver. 22); they are so many prayers heard. But what distinguishes His position from that of other divine messengers, who have accomplished similar works by the same means, is the perfect assurance of being heard, with which He addresses God. He draws freely, as Son, from the divine treasure. *Besser* admirably says: "No doubt, He performed all His miracles through faith, but through faith *which was peculiar to Him*, that of being the Son of God manifested in the flesh."

If Jesus expresses His gratitude aloud, as He does here, it is not, as He Himself adds, because there is anything extraordinary in the conduct of the Father towards Him on this occasion. This act of thanksgiving is anything but an exclamation wrested from Him by surprise at an exceptional hearing of prayer; constantly heard by the Father, He thanks Him

continually. That which, at this solemn moment, impels Him to give thanks to His Father aloud, is the sight of the people who surround Him. He has prepared His disciples and the two sisters, in the special conversations with them, to behold and understand the work which He is about to do. He desires also to dispose the people whom His Father has unexpectedly gathered around this tomb, to behold *the glory of God*, that is to say, to see in the miracle, not only a wonder, but a sign. Otherwise the astonishment which they experience would be barren; it could not result in faith. Here is the reason why Jesus expresses aloud, at this moment, the sentiment of filial thankfulness which incessantly fills His heart. Criticism has called this prayer "a prayer of ostentation" (*Strauss, Weiss, Baur*), and has found in this circumstance a ground for suspecting the authenticity of the narrative. It has not grasped the meaning of the act. Jesus does not render thanks because of the people, but He *expresses aloud* His act of thanksgiving because of the people. The Jews had said of the healing of the man born blind: As an infraction of the Sabbath, this cannot be a divine work. By rendering thanks to God on this day in presence of all the people, even before performing the miracle, Jesus positively calls upon God to grant or to refuse Him His coöperation. In the face of such a prayer God must be recognized either as the guarantor of His mission or as the accomplice in His imposture. Comp. the test of Carmel in the life of Elijah, and the quite similar expression of Jesus Himself in Luke v. 22-24. If Lazarus rises and comes forth at the call of Jesus, it will be God who has displayed His arm; Jesus will be recognized as sent by Him. If not, truly let all His other miracles be attributed to Beelzebub, and let Him be declared an impostor! Such is the situation as Jesus' act of thanksgiving establishes it. It is interesting to compare this expression: *Thou hast heard me*, with the assertion of *Reville*, following *Scholten* and saying: "The fourth Gospel has no knowledge of Jesus praying as a man." (*Revue de théol.*, 1865, iii., p. 316.)

Vv. 43, 44. "And after having spoken thus, he cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth. 44. And<sup>1</sup> the dead man came forth, his feet and hands bound with bandages; and his face was wrapped in a napkin. Jesus says to them, Loose him and let him<sup>2</sup> go." The loud voice is the expression of a determined will which has the feeling of its own sovereignty. As one awakens a man from sleep by calling him by his name, so Jesus brings back Lazarus from death which is only a more profound sleep (vv. 11, 12) by loudly calling him. "Undoubtedly these external signs are only, as *Hengstenberg* says, for the persons present; the power of raising to life resides, not in the voice, but in the will which expresses itself through it;" we will rather say: in the power of God of which Jesus disposes by virtue of the hearing of His prayer. In speaking to the daughter of Jairus and to the young man of Nain, He simply said: *Arise*, or: *Awake*, because they were lying on the bed or the bier; here

<sup>1</sup> Καί is wanting in B C L Sah. It is found in all the other Mj. (including 8) and Vss.

<sup>2</sup> B C L read αυτον after αφετε.

He says: *Come forth*, because Lazarus is shut within the sepulchre. The simplicity and brevity of these two words: *δεῖρο ἐξω* (literally, *Here without!*) form a magnificent contrast with their efficacy. How can Weiss assert that the voice of Jesus does nothing but recall to the light Lazarus whom God had raised to life? Do not the words of vv. 19, 20 show us the power of God really acting through Jesus, and Jesus Himself raising the dead to life by this power of which He is the organ?

The act of *coming forth*, ver. 44, presents no difficulty, either because the bandages by which the shroud was fastened were sufficiently loose to allow movements, or because each limb was wrapped separately, as was the practice among the Egyptians. The detail: *His face was wrapped about with a napkin*, is the pencil-stroke of an eye-witness and recalls the ineffaceable impression produced on the bystanders by this spectacle of a living man in the costume of the dead. While they remained motionless with astonishment, Jesus, with perfect composure and as if nothing extraordinary had occurred, invites them to participate in the work: Each to his office; I have raised to life; it is for you to loose him. The command: *Let him go*, recalls that which Jesus gave to Jairus and his wife after having raised their child to life. Nothing disturbs His calmness after these unparalleled works which He has just accomplished. The term *ἰπάγειν*, *go away*, has something victorious in it, altogether like the command of Jesus to the impotent man who was healed: *Take up thy bed, and walk!*

The resurrection of Lazarus is the miracle of friendship, as the wonder of Cana is that of filial piety; and this, not only because the affection of Jesus for the family of Bethany was the cause of it, but especially because Jesus performed it with a distinct consciousness that, in raising His friend, He was rendering more certain and hastening His own death (comp. vv. 8-16 and vv. 33-38). The self-devotion of friendship rises here to the point of heroism. John had understood this. This thought is the soul of his narrative; it appears clearly from the following passage.

### III.—*The effect produced by the miracle: vv. 45-47.*

1. And first, the immediate effect on the spectators:

Vv. 45, 46. "*Many therefore*<sup>1</sup> *of the Jews, those who had come*<sup>2</sup> *to Mary and had seen that which*<sup>3</sup> *he had done, believed on him.* 46. *But some of them went away to the Pharisees and told them that which*<sup>3</sup> *Jesus had done.*" Again a division among the spectators, and a still more profound one than on any of the previous occasions. For it penetrated even into the midst of the Jewish party. It is impossible, indeed, to include the *some* of whom ver. 46 speaks in the class of the *πολλοί*, *many*, of ver. 45, and to ascribe to them, as a consequence, a benevolent intention in the step which they take before the enemies of Jesus, as *Origen* thought. There is an antithesis between the two subjects: *many* and *some*, as between the two verbs:

<sup>1</sup> N: δε instead of ουν.

<sup>2</sup> D: των ελθόντων instead of οι ελθόντες.

<sup>3</sup> Instead of α, ο is read in B C D in ver. 45, and in C D M in ver. 46.

believed (ver. 45) and *went away* (ver. 46). Only it must be carefully noticed that the first (the πολλοί, of ver. 45) are not merely a part of the visitors of Martha and Mary, but include them all; this is indicated by the participles in the nominative with the article οἱ: *Those who had come and who had seen*. In the opposite case, the participles ought to be in the genitive: many of those who came and saw. The *some* of ver. 46 are therefore other Jews (ἐξ αὐτῶν refers to the word Ἰουδαίων alone), who saw without having *come*, either inhabitants of Bethany, or visitors who were not with Mary when she had run to the tomb and who had not been present at the scene. This explains the difficult expression: "who came to Mary." Why to Mary only? Is she named here as the one best known (Weiss) or as the most afflicted (Luthardt, Keil)? Both of these explanations are very unnatural. She is named because it was *near her* that the Jews who came found themselves when they went to the sepulchre and *with her* that they had been witnesses of the miracle (comp. vv. 31, 33).

2. The more remote effect of the resurrection of Lazarus: vv. 47-53.

Vv. 47-50. "The chief priests and Pharisees therefore gathered an assembly, and they said, What shall we do? For this man does many miracles. 48. If we let him alone, all will believe on him, and the Romans will come and they will destroy both<sup>1</sup> our place and nation. 49. But one of them, Caiaphas, who was high-priest of that year, said to them: You know nothing at all, 50 and you do not consider<sup>2</sup> that it is better for us<sup>3</sup> that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation should not perish." The resurrection of Lazarus was not the cause of Jesus' death; but it occasioned and hastened the decree of His condemnation. The cup was full; this made it overflow. The Pharisees are specially named because they were the instigators of this hostile meeting (ver. 46; ix. 45); but it was the chief priests who officially convoked it. The absence of the article before συνέδριον might be explained by supposing that John is here using this word as a proper name. It is more natural, however, to take the term in the general meaning of *assembly* or *council*, which it has also in the profane Greek. The present ποιούμεν, "what do we" takes the place of a future; it makes prominent the imminence of the danger. "It is absolutely necessary to do something, but what?" "Οτι: because of the fact that. "His doing must decide ours." The fear expressed in ver. 48 was not without foundation. The least commotion might serve the Romans as a pretext for depriving the people of Israel of the remnant of independence which they still enjoyed, and in that case what would become of the power of the Sanhedrim? The disquietude of the rulers has reference especially to the destruction of *their* power. This is emphatically expressed by the position of the pronoun ἡμῶν (*of us, our*) before the two substantives. Jesus reproduced this thought of the rulers in the words of the laborers in the vineyard, Matt. xxi. 38: "Let us kill him and secure the inheritance." Jerusalem, Israel, belong to them. "Our place" natur-

<sup>1</sup> D K H 10 Vss. omit και before τον τοπον.

<sup>2</sup> B D L some Mnn. Orig. read λογίζεσθε instead of διαλογίζεσθε.

<sup>3</sup> The MSS. are divided between ημιν (*us*) (T. R. with A E G etc.), and υμιν (*you*) (B D L M X T). N omits both.

ally designates the capital, as the seat of their government, rather than the temple (*Lücke, de Wette*, etc.), or the whole of Judea (*Bengel*). In the first sense, this term is also more naturally connected with the following expression: *our nation*; that which we govern from this place. As they speak from a political point of view, contrasting nation with nation, they employ the term *ἔθνος*, and not *λαός*, which is the name of honor for the people of Israel.

The expression: *one of them*, hardly allows us to suppose that Caiaphas was presiding over the assembly. Although, indeed, it seems now to be proved that the high-priest was at the same time president of the Sanhedrim (*Schürer, Lehrb. der N. T. Zeitgesch.*, p. 411), we must not forget that this was not a regular meeting (ver. 47). In the midst of a company of irresolute spirits, who are wavering between conscience and interest, an energetic man, who boldly denies the rights of conscience and unscrupulously puts forward reasons of state, has always the chance of carrying his point. If this had occurred in the best days of the theocracy, the expression: *High-priest of that year*, would be incomprehensible; for, according to the law, the pontificate was for life. But, since the Roman dominion, the masters of the country fearing the power which a permanent office gives, had adopted the custom of frequently replacing one high-priest by another. According to Josephus (*Antiq.*, xviii. 2. 2), the Roman governor Valerius Gratus "took away the high-priestly office from Ananus and conferred it on Ishmael; then, having deposed the latter a little while afterwards, he established as high-priest Eleazar, the son of Ananus: after a year had elapsed, he deposed this last person and nominated Simon in his place; he held the office only one year, and Joseph, surnamed Caiaphas, was made his successor." Caiaphas remained in office from the year 25 to the year 36 of our era; consequently, the entire ministry of Jesus was passed under his pontificate. These frequent changes justify the expression of the evangelist, and deprive criticism of the right to assert that the author of our Gospel was ignorant of the fact that the high-priesthood, from its foundation, was a life-office. But if Caiaphas had been high-priest for eleven official years, how could St. John use three times (vv. 49-51; xviii. 13) the expression: "High-priest of that year?" We find the pronoun *ἐκεῖνος* used here in the particularly emphatic sense which it has so frequently in this Gospel; not, that more remote year, in opposition to some other nearer one, but, that *unique*, decisive year, in which the Messiah was put to death and the priesthood, with the theocracy, came to its end. The apostrophe of Caiaphas to his colleagues has a certain character of rudeness. This feature, as *Hengstenberg* observes, agrees with the behavior of the Sadducean sect to which Caiaphas belonged; comp. Acts iv. 6 and v. 17, and Josephus, *Antiq.*, xx. 9. 1. In *Bell. Jud.*, ii. 8, 14, this historian says: "The Pharisees are friendly to each other, and cultivate harmony among themselves with a view to the common benefit; but the manners of the Sadducees are much more rude both towards each other and towards their equals, whom they treat as strangers." *Hengstenberg* takes *διαλογίζεσθε* in an intransitive sense and the

following *ὅτι* in the sense of *because*: *You do not consider, seeing that it is more advantageous that . . .*” But it is more natural to make the clause which begins with *ὅτι* the content of *διαλογίζεσθε*: “*You know nothing and you do not consider that . . .*” The reading *διαλογίζεσθε*: “*You do not know how to clear up by reasoning . . .*” is preferable to the simple *λογίζεσθε* which results from negligence or from a mistaken correction. The reading *ἡμῖν*, *for us*, has fundamentally the same sense as the variant *ὑμῖν*, *for you*; but it somewhat better disguises the egoistic and personal character of the opinion expressed (comp. the *ἡμῶν* of ver. 48). The use of the terms *λαός* and *ἔθνος* in ver. 50 is not arbitrary. The first (corresponding to the Hebrew *am*) designates the multitude of individuals forming the theocratic nation, in opposition to the single individual who is to perish, while the second, answering to *goi*, designates Israel as a political body in contrast with the foreign nationality, that of the Romans.

Vv. 51, 52. “*Now he did not say this of himself; but being high-priest of that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for the nation, 52 and not for the nation only, but also that he might gather in one body the children of God who are scattered abroad.*” This opinion of the high-priest was made especially remarkable by the contrast between the divine truth which it expressed and the diabolical design which inspired it. The evangelist calls attention to this. Some interpreters (*Luthardt, Brückner*) deny that John ascribes the gift of prophecy here to the high-priest as such. It was not as high-priest, but as high-priest *of that year*, that Caiaphas uttered this prophetic declaration. But the relation between the present participle *ὄν*, *being*, and the aorist, *προεφήτευσεν*, *he prophesied*, leads us naturally to the idea that the evangelist attaches to the office of Caiaphas the prophetic character of the words which he uttered at this moment. This must be acknowledged even if we are to find here only a Jewish superstition. In the Old Testament, the normal centre of the theocratic people is, not the royal office, but the priesthood. In all the decisive moments for the life of the people, it is the high-priest who is the organ of God for passing over to the people the decision with which its salvation is connected (Exod. xxviii. 30; Num. xxvii. 21; 1 Sam. xxx. 7 ff.). It is true that this prerogative came not from a prophetic gift, but from the possession of a mysterious power, the Urim and Thummim. It is also true that from the time of the captivity, and even from the reign of Solomon, there is no longer any question of this power (see Keil, *Bibl. Archaeol.*, p. 191). But the high-priest nevertheless remained by reason of his very office the head of the theocratic body, and this in spite of the moral contrast which might exist between the spirit of his office and his personal character. If the heart of the high-priest was in harmony with his office, his heart became the normal organ of the divine decision. But if there was opposition in this personage between the disposition of his heart and the holiness of his office, it must be expected that, as in the present case, the divine oracle would be seen coming from this consecrated mouth in the form of the most diabolical maxim. What, indeed, more worthy of the Divine Spirit than to condemn His degenerate organ thus to utter the truth of God at the very

moment when he was speaking as the organ of his own particular interest! Without attributing to Caiaphas a permanent prophetic gift, John means to say that, at this supreme moment for the theocracy and for humanity, it was not without the participation of the Divine activity that the most profound mystery of the plan of God was proclaimed by him in the form of the most detestable maxim. John has already more than once remarked how the adversaries of Jesus, when speaking derisively, were prophesying in spite of themselves: "*No one knows whence he is*" (vii. 27). "*Will he go and teach the Greeks*" (vii. 35)? If the devil often travesties the words of God, it pleases God sometimes to parody those of the devil, by giving to them an unexpected truth. This "divine irony" manifested itself in the highest degree on this occasion, which was the prelude to the accomplishment of the most divine mystery under the form of the most monstrous act.

According to some interpreters, the  $\delta\tau\iota$  is not a direct complement of the verb *he prophesied*. *Meyer*: "he prophesied as to the fact that . . ." *Luthardt, Weiss, Keil*: "he prophesied, seeing that *really* Jesus was to . . ." Ver. 52 is what has led them to these explanations, because this verse goes in fact beyond the import of the saying of Caiaphas. But it is quite unnatural to take this word: *he prophesied*, in an absolute sense: John certainly did not mean to insist so especially on this idea of prophecy. The meaning is simply: "he declared prophetically *that* to . . ." As to ver. 52, it is an explanatory appendix, which John adds in order to indicate that in the divine thought the force of the expression: *one for all*, had a far wider application than that which Caiaphas himself gave it. John never forgets his Greek readers, and he loses no occasion of recalling to them their part in the accomplishment of the divine promises. If we take into consideration the parallelism between this ver. 52 and the saying of x. 16, we shall have no hesitation in applying the term *children of God* to heathen predisposed to faith through the revelation of the Logos (i. 4, 10); the sense is the same as that in which John uses the expressions: *to be of God* (viii. 47), *to be of the truth* (xix. 37). The term *children of God* naturally involves an anticipation; it designates the actual condition of these future believers from the point of view of its result which was to come. *Meyer, Luthardt* and others prefer to explain this term from the standpoint of the divine predestination. But we should be obliged to infer from this that all the rest of the heathen are the objects of an opposite predestination.

Ver. 53. "*From this day forth, therefore, they took counsel together*<sup>1</sup> *to the end that they might put him to death.*" The *therefore* intimates that the proposition of Caiaphas was accepted (*Luthardt*), probably in silence and without the intervention of an official vote. From this day forward, a permanent conspiracy was organized against the life of Jesus. The daily conferences of His adversaries became, according to the expression of *Lange*, "meetings of Messianic murder." There was no more hesitation

<sup>1</sup> Instead of  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\omicron$ ,  $\aleph$  B D 4 Mm. Orig. (once) read  $\epsilon\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\omicron$ .

as to the end; the indecision was henceforth only with reference to the time and the means. Such was the importance of this meeting and consequently, in an indirect way, that of the resurrection of Lazarus.

3. The sojourn at Ephraim: vv. 54-57.

Jesus is forced to withdraw to a retired place. On their part, the rulers take a new step in the path on which they have now entered.

Vv. 54-57. "Jesus therefore abode no more openly among the Jews; but he departed thence and went into the country near to the wilderness, into a city called Ephraim; <sup>1</sup> and he remained <sup>2</sup> there with his <sup>3</sup> disciples. 55. Now the Passover of the Jews was at hand; and many went up to Jerusalem out of the country before the Passover, to purify themselves. 56. They sought for Jesus therefore and said among themselves, as they stood in the temple, What think you? Do you think that he will not come to the feast? 57. Now the chief priests and the Pharisees had also <sup>4</sup> given commandment <sup>5</sup> that, if any one knew where he was, he should declare it, in order that they might take him." Ephraim is mentioned sometimes with Bethel (2 Chron. xiii. 19; Joseph. Bell. Jud. iv. 9. 9). This city was therefore a few leagues northward of Jerusalem; according to Eusebius, eight miles, according to Jerome, twenty miles to the northeast of that capital. This locality, by reason of its retired situation and its proximity to the desert, was favorable to the design of Jesus. He might in the solitude prepare His disciples for His approaching end and, if He was pursued, He might retire into the desert. This desert is, as Lange says, the northern extremity of the barren strip of country by which the plateau of the mountains of Judah and Benjamin is separated throughout its whole length from the valley of the Jordan and the Dead Sea. From this place Jesus could, at will, on the approach of the Passover, either join the pilgrims from Galilee who went directly to Jerusalem through Samaria, or go down to Jericho, in the plain of the Jordan, to put Himself at the head of the caravan which came from Perea. We know from the Synoptics that He took the latter course. *Μετά* (ver. 54) is not synonymous with *σίν*; the meaning is: "He confined Himself there to the society of His disciples;" and not only: He was there with them.

*Ἐκ τῆς χωρᾶς* (ver. 55) does not refer to the *country* of Ephraim in particular (*Grotius, Olshausen*) but to the *country region* in general, in opposition to the capital (ver. 54): "They went up from different parts of the country." The law did not prescribe special purifications before the Passover; but, in several passages of the Old Testament, it was ordained that the people should purify themselves on the eve of any important occasion (Gen. xxxv. 2; Exod. xix. 10, 11, etc.). This principle had naturally been applied to the Passover feast (2 Chron. xxx. 16-20).

Ver. 56 vividly depicts the restless curiosity of these country people who, assembled in groups in the temple, were discussing with reference

<sup>1</sup> N L It. Vulg. Iren. read *Ἐφραμ* instead of *Ἐφραϊμ*.

<sup>2</sup> N R L Orig. read *ἔμεινεν* instead of *διέτριβεν*.

<sup>3</sup> B D I L Γ Δ omit *αυτου*.

<sup>4</sup> 11 Mjj. (N A B etc.) 35 Mnn. It. Vulg. Syr. Cop. Orig. omit *καί*, which is read by T. It. with D E G H I S Γ Mnn.

<sup>5</sup> N B I M 3 Mnn. Orig. read *εντολας* instead of *εντολην*.

to the approaching arrival of Jesus; comp. vii. 12.—Ἐστηκότες, *standing*, in the attitude of expectation.—Ὅτι does not depend on δοκεῖ; it is more natural to separate the two clauses and to make two distinct questions. The aorist ἐλθῆν may perfectly well refer to an act which is to be accomplished in the immediate future.

To the other grounds which rendered the coming of Jesus improbable, ver. 57 adds a new one, which is more special. It would not have been very difficult for the authorities to discover the place of Jesus' retreat. The edict which is here spoken of was therefore rather a means of intimidating Him and His followers, and of accustoming the people to regard Him as a dangerous and criminal person. It is a new link in the series of hostile measures so well described by St. John from chap. v. onward; comp. v. 16, 18; vii. 32; ix. 22; xi. 53; and this is indicated by the καί, *also*, in the T. R.; perhaps the word was omitted in the Alexandrian text, as not being understood. The chief priests were the authority from which the decree officially emanated; the evangelist adds the *Pharisees*, because this party was the real author of it. Comp. vii. 45. In the Babylonian Gemara (edited from ancient traditions about 550) the following passage is found: "Tradition reports that on the evening of the Passover Jesus was crucified (hanged), and that this took place after an officer had during forty days publicly proclaimed: This man who by his deception has seduced the people ought to be crucified. Whosoever can allege anything in his defense, let him come forward and speak. But no one found anything to say in his defense. He was hanged therefore on the evening of the Passover" (Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr. et. Talm.*, p. 490). This remarkable passage may be compared with this of John. In both, we discover, a few weeks before the Passover, a public proclamation on the part of the Sanhedrim, relative to the approaching condemnation of Jesus. On the other hand, the difference between the two accounts is so marked that one of them cannot have arisen from the other.

#### *On the resurrection of Lazarus.*

"This narrative," says *Deutinger*,<sup>1</sup> "is distinguished among all the narrations of the fourth Gospel by its peculiar vivacity and its dramatic movement. The characters are drawn by a hand at once firm and delicate. Nowhere is the relation of Christ to His disciples set forth in so life-like a manner; we are initiated by this narrative into that intimate intercourse, that affectionate interchange of feelings and thoughts, which existed between the Master and His own followers; the disciples are described in the most attractive way; we see them in their simple frankness and noble devotion. The Jews themselves, of whom we know scarcely anything in our gospel except their obstinate resistance to the efforts of Jesus, show themselves here in a less unfavorable aspect, as friends of the two afflicted sisters; the man is discovered in the Jew. But above all, how distinct and delicate is the sketching of the character of the two women; with what nicety and what psychological depth is the difference in their conduct described!" In these

<sup>1</sup> *Das Reich Gottes nach dem Apostel Johannes*, 1862, vol. ii., p. 62.

characteristics of the narrative which are so well summed up by the German writer, we find the first proof of its intrinsic truthfulness: "invented stories are not of this sort." And especially, it was not thus that invented stories were formed in the second century; we have the proof of this in the Apocryphal narratives.

The reality of the event here related appears also from its connection with the whole course of the previous and subsequent history of Jesus. The evangelist is fully conscious of the consequences of the event which he describes; he distinctly marks them in the course of his narrative: ver. 47 (*therefore*) and ver. 53 (*from that day forth*). Comp. xii. 9-11, 17-19. *Renan* calls the resurrection of Lazarus "a necessary link in the story of the final catastrophe." The former, therefore, is not a fictitious event, if the latter is not. Finally, this narrative contains with exactness a mass of details which would be in manifest contradiction to the aim of the narrative, provided the latter were composed artificially with the purpose of teaching and illustrating the speculation of the Logos; thus the tears of Jesus, the moral and even physical agitation which is attributed to Him, His prayer for the securing of the miracle, and His thanksgiving for the hearing of the prayer. Nothing can be more truly human than all these features of the story, which are altogether the opposite of the metaphysics of Philo.

Objection is made, 1. That such a miracle is absolutely inconceivable, especially if we explain the words: *by this time he stinketh*, in the sense of dissolution already begun. Herein perhaps lies what has led some interpreters, who are defenders of the reality of the miracle (*Weiss, Keil*) to find in these words only a logical supposition on Martha's part. "The bond between the soul and the body," says *Weiss*, "was not yet finally broken so as to allow the beginning of dissolution." *Reuss* does not admit this method of cheapening the miracle. "The odor of the decaying body" seems to him to be an essential feature of the narrative which was designed to illustrate the declaration: "I am the resurrection and the life." And he is the one who is right. When we shall know thoroughly what life is and what death is, we shall be able to decide what is suited to this domain and what is not. While waiting for this, we must say: He who has created the organic cell within the inorganic matter is not incapable of re-establishing life within the inanimate substance.

Objectors allege, 2. The omission of this miracle in the Synoptics. But in the Synoptics themselves are there not many differences of the same kind? Has not each one of them preserved elements of the highest interest which are omitted in the others? They are collections of particular anecdotes, of isolated or orally transmitted events. The formation of these collections was affected by accidental circumstances of which we are ignorant. Thus Luke alone has preserved for us the account of the resurrection of the young man of Nain. It is to be observed, moreover, that the three Synoptical narratives are divided into two great cycles: the events of the prophetic ministry of Jesus in Galilee, and those of the week of the Passion in Jerusalem; they only glance at the intermediate sojourn in Peræa. Now the resurrection of Lazarus belongs to this epoch of transition and for this reason it may easily have lost its place in the general tradition. Luke himself, says *Hase*, "has only his fragmentary story respecting the two sisters (x. 38 ff.), the prelude of this one, while ignorant of what belongs to their persons and their abode" (p. 512). Finally, the fact which can more particularly explain the omission of this incident in the Apostolic tradition, from

which, for the most part, our Synoptic narratives came, is the hesitation which might have been felt either to open to the view of the public an interior life so sacred as that of the family beloved by Jesus, or of exposing the members of that family themselves to the vengeance of the rulers, who at the time of the first preaching of the Gospel were still the masters of the country. Comp. xii. 10, where they deliberate as to putting Lazarus to death at the same time with Jesus. The case stood thus until the destruction of Jerusalem and the fall of the Sanhedrim. This is the reason why John, when these events were once consummated, could feel free to draw forth this scene from the silence into which it had fallen since the day of Pentecost. *Meyer, Weiss* and others object that the Synoptical authors, writing probably at a time when the members of the Bethany family were already dead, would not have allowed themselves to be stopped by this consideration. But they forget that the omission was occasioned in the oral tradition from the earliest times of the Church, and that it had passed quite naturally into the written redaction of the primitive proclamation of the Gospel story, that is to say, into our Synoptic Gospels.

Moreover, the explanations which have been attempted in order to eliminate this miracle from the circle of the authentic facts of the life of Jesus, present, none of them, any degree of probability whatever.

1. The so-called natural explanation of *Paulus, Gabler* and *A. Schweizer*. In consequence of the message of ver. 3, Jesus judged the malady to be by no means dangerous; then, after having received notice again (*Paulus* reckons as many as four messages), He comes to see that the matter is a mere lethargy. Having reached the sepulchre, He observed in the supposed deceased person some signs of life; whereupon He gave thanks (vv. 41, 42) and called Lazarus forth. The latter revived by the coolness of the sepulchre, by the odor of the perfumes, and at the moment of the opening of the tomb, by the warmth of the external air, rose up in full life. Thus *Paulus* and *Gabler*. According to *A. Schweizer*, the confidence of Jesus in the cure of His friend was founded only on His faith in the divine aid promised in a general way to His cause; and the pretended miracle was only the happy coincidence of this religious confidence with the circumstance that Lazarus was not really dead. This explanation has not been judged more severely by any one than by *Strauss*<sup>1</sup> and *Baur*.<sup>2</sup> The former has shown, in opposition to *Paulus* and *Gabler*, that the expressions by which Jesus announces the resurrection of Lazarus are too positive to be only conjectures founded upon uncertain symptoms, and that the meaning of the entire narrative, in the thought of the narrator, is and can be only that which every reader finds in it: the resurrection of Lazarus, who was dead, by the miraculous power of Jesus. As to the manner in which *Schweizer* treats our Gospel in general and this passage in particular, the following is *Baur's* judgment: "Destitute of all feeling for the unity of the whole, he tears our Gospel to shreds, that he may eliminate as superstitious interpolations all things of which he does not succeed in giving a shallow rationalistic explanation, and may leave all which he allows to remain to the marvellous action of chance." These last words are especially applicable to the opinion of *Schweizer* respecting this miracle.

But what explanations do these two critics oppose to this of their predecessors?

2. The *mythical* explanation of *Strauss*. The Old Testament related resurrections of dead persons effected by mere prophets; the Christian legend could do

<sup>1</sup> *Vie de Jésus*, t. ii., pp. 154-165.

<sup>2</sup> *Theol. Jahrb.*, vol. iii., 1844.

no less than ascribe to the Messiah miracles of the same kind. But is it really to be admitted that the legend succeeded in producing a narrative so admirably shaded and in creating personages so finely drawn? "One cannot understand," says *Renan* justly, "how a popular creation should have come to take its place in a framework of recollections which are so personal as those which are connected with the relations of Jesus to the family of Bethany." Moreover, legend idealizes; how could it ever have invented a Christ moved even to the inmost depths of His being and shedding tears before the tomb of the friend whom He was going to raise to life? Then is not *Baur* right as against Strauss, when he says: "If a mythical tradition of this sort had really been spread abroad in the Church, it would not have failed to enter, with so many other similar ones, into the Synoptic narrative. It is contrary to all probability that so important a miracle, to which was attributed a decisive influence on the final catastrophe, should have remained a local legend restricted to a very limited circle." Notwithstanding these difficulties, *Révillon* "feels no embarrassment" in explaining the history of Lazarus by the mythical process. The legend meant to represent by Lazarus the Jewish proletariat (comp. Luke xvi. 20), which Jesus rescues from its spiritual death by loving it and weeping over it. "He bent over this tomb (Israelitish pauperism!) crying out to Lazarus: Come forth, and come to me! and Lazarus came forth pale . . . tottering."<sup>1</sup> We may not discuss such fancies. *Renan* judges them no less severely than ourselves: "Expedients of theologians at their wits' end," he says, "saving themselves by allegory, myth, symbol" (p. 508). There is, above all, one circumstance which ought to prevent any serious critic from attributing to this narrative a legendary origin. Myths of this sort are fictions isolated from one another; but we have seen how the story of the resurrection of Lazarus belongs thoroughly within the organism of the fourth Gospel. The work of John is evidently of one cast. With regard to such an evangelist, criticism is irresistibly driven to this dilemma: historian or artist? It is the merit of *Baur* to have understood this situation, and, since by reason of his dogmatic premises he could not admit the first alternative, to have frankly declared himself in favor of the second.

3. The *speculative* explanation of *Baur*, according to which our narrative is a fictitious representation designed to give a body to the metaphysical thesis formulated in ver. 25: "*I am the resurrection and the life.*" This explanation suits the idea which *Baur* forms of our Gospel, which, according to him, is altogether only a composition of an ideal character. But is it compatible with the simplicity, the candor, the prosaic character, and if we may be allowed the expression, the common-place of the whole narrative? From the one end to the other, the situations are described for their own sake and without the least tendency to idealize (comp. for example, the end of the chapter: the sojourn at Ephraim, the proclamation of the Sanhedrim, the conversations of the pilgrims to Jerusalem). Still more, the narrative offers features which are completely anti-rational and anti-speculative. We have shown this: this Jesus who groans and weeps is the opposite of a metaphysical creation. The very offense which these features of the narrative cause to *Baur's* mind, prove this. The products of the intellect are transparent to the intellect. The more mysterious and unexpected these features are, the more is it manifest that they were drawn from reality. The feeling is impressed on every reader

<sup>1</sup> *Revue germanique*, Dec. 1st, 1863, p. 613.

that the author himself seriously believes in the reality of the fact which he relates, and that he does not think of inventing. When Plato comes to clothe his elevated doctrines with the brilliant veil of myths, we feel that he himself hovers above his creation, that his mind has freely chosen this form of teaching and plays with it. Here, on the contrary, the author is himself under the sway of the fact related; his heart is penetrated by it, his entire personality is laid hold of. If he created, he must be regarded as the first dupe of his own fiction.

4. The more recent critics turn in general towards another mode of explanation. *Weisse* had already expressed the idea that our narrative might be merely a parable related by Jesus and that tradition had transformed it into a real fact. The idea reappears at the present day in *Keim*, *Schenkcl*, *Holtzmann*, etc. It is the parable of the beggar Lazarus (Luke xvi.), which has given occasion to our narrative; the author of our Gospel drew from it the theme of his representation. *Renan* imagines a similar comparison. He explained originally the resurrection of Lazarus by a pious fraud, to which Jesus Himself was not a stranger. "The friends of Jesus desired a great miracle which should make a strong impression upon the unbelief of Jerusalem. . . . Lazarus, yet pale from his sickness, had himself wrapped with bandages like a dead person and shut up in his family tomb. . . . Jesus desired once more to see him whom He had loved. . ." The rest is easily understood. *Renan* excuses Jesus: "In that impure city of Jerusalem, He was no longer Himself. . . . In despair, driven to extremity. . . He yielded to the torrent. He submitted to the miracles which public opinion demanded of Him, rather than performed them." "No enemy of the Son of man," says *Hase* rightly, "has ever declared anything worse against Jesus, than that which this romantic well-wisher has here said." At present, *Renan*, yielding the general feeling of reprobation which this explanation aroused, thinks that in a conversation of Mary and Martha with Jesus, they told Him how the resurrection of a dead person would be necessary to bring the triumph of His cause and that Jesus answered them: "If Lazarus himself were to come back to life, they would not believe it." This saying became afterwards the subject of singular mistakes. . . . The supposition in fact was changed . . . ; tradition attributed to Mary and Martha a sick brother whom Jesus had caused to go forth from the tomb. In a word, the misapprehension from which our narrative springs resembles one of those cock-and-bull stories which are so frequent in the little towns of the East (13th ed., pp. 372-374). For a complete refutation, we will only call attention to the point that the narrative is of a fact which is just the opposite of the idea expressed by the saying which is said to have furnished the text for it. The idea of *Weisse* is wrecked against difficulties which are no less serious. There is nothing in common between the parable of Luke xvi. and our narrative except the name of Lazarus, "very common among the Jews" (*Hase*). The entire parable has as its starting-point the poverty and complete destitution of Lazarus. In the story of John, on the contrary, the brother of Martha and Mary is surrounded by friends, cared for, in the enjoyment of consideration and competence. There, Abraham refuses to allow Lazarus to leave Hades and reappear here on earth. Here, Lazarus returns to the earth and is restored to his sisters and friends. The result of this return to life is that many Jews, until now unbelieving, "believe on Jesus," a point which is directly contradictory to the last words of Jesus in the parable. So *Reuss* concludes the discussion by saying: "It must be acknowledged that all the attempts to set aside the miracle are arbitrary. No

explanation of all those which have been proposed bears in itself a character of probability and simplicity such that one is tempted to substitute it for the traditional form of the narrative."

We add further one general observation: In its first phase, the apostolic preaching confined itself to proclaiming this great fact: Jesus is risen. This was the foundation on which the apostles built up the Church. The detailed scenes of Jesus' ministry might indeed play a part in the particular conversations, but the great official proclamation did not place anything beside the death and resurrection of the Messiah, the facts on which rested the salvation of the world. Any particular miracle was a fact too accidental and secondary compared with these, to have the importance attached to it which we, from our historical and critical point of view, are tempted to give to the mention or the omission of it. We have one of the most striking examples of this in the silence of the three Synoptics and of John himself respecting one of the most important and most undeniable facts of the evangelical history: that of the appearance of Jesus to the five hundred brethren, mentioned by Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 6. After this let one argue, if he will, from the silence of one, two, or even three evangelical writings against the reality of a fact of the evangelical history! *Spinoza*, according to the testimony of *Bayle*, is said to have declared to his friends, "that if he could have persuaded himself of the resurrection of Lazarus, he would have dashed in pieces his own system and embraced without repugnance the common faith of Christians." Let the reader take up anew the narrative of John and read it again without any preconceived opinion . . . the conviction to which the pantheistic philosopher could not come will form itself spontaneously within him; and on the testimony of this narrative, every feature of which bears the stamp of truth, he will simply accept a fact which criticism endeavors in vain to do away by means of a series of attempts of which every one is the denial of the one that preceded it.

## SECOND SECTION.

### XII. 1-36.

#### THE LAST DAYS OF THE MINISTRY OF JESUS.

This section includes three parts: 1. The supper of Jesus at Bethany: vv. 1-11. 2. His entry into Jerusalem: vv. 12-19. 3. The last scene of His ministry in the temple: vv. 20-36.

These three facts are selected by the evangelist as forming the transition from the public ministry of Jesus to His Passion. This appears, in the first part, from the discontent of Judas, the prelude of His treason, and from the response of Jesus announcing His approaching death; in the second, from ver. 19, which shows the necessity in which the rulers found themselves, after Palm-day, of rendering homage to Jesus or of ridding themselves of Him. Finally, in the third, from the entire discourse of Jesus in answer to the step taken by the Greeks, and from His final farewell to the Jewish nation, ver. 36. In the first two divisions, the evangelist at the same time sets forth the influence which the resurrection of Lazarus had upon the course of things as he describes it: vv. 2, 9-11,

17-19. Thus all things in this narrative, though apparently fragmentary, are in reality closely linked together. *Luthardt* rightly says: "This chapter is at once a closing and a preparation."

### 1. *The Supper at Bethany*: vv. 1-11.

In the presence of the great struggle of whose approach every one has a presentiment, the devotion of the friends of Jesus becomes loftier; by way of counter-stroke, the national hostility, which has its representative even among the Twelve, breaks out in this inmost circle; Jesus announces to the traitor with perfect gentleness the approaching result of his enmity towards Him.

Ver. 1. "*Six days before the Passover, Jesus came therefore to Bethany where Lazarus<sup>1</sup> was whom he had raised from the dead.*" It would seem from the Synoptics that Jesus came directly to Jerusalem from Peræa, passing through Jericho. In order to bring them into agreement with John, it is enough to suppose that Jesus descended from Ephraim into the valley of the Jordan and rejoined before Jericho the great caravan of pilgrims who came from Galilee through Peræa. He thus took, in the reverse way, the same road which Epiphanius afterwards traversed—who relates to us "that he went up from Jericho to the plateau with a man who accompanied him across the desert, from Bethel to Ephraim." In truth, I do not understand why this so simple hypothesis should shock the impartiality of *Meyer*. He presents as an objection the statement in xi. 54; but the time of silence was now past for Jesus. We know from Luke that already before entering into Jericho Jesus was surrounded by a considerable multitude (xviii. 36), that he passed the night at the house of Zachæus (xix. 1 ff.), and that the expectation of all was excited in the highest degree (xix. 11; Matt. xx. 20 ff.). The distance from Jericho to Bethany might be passed over in five or six hours. The main part of the caravan continued its journey even to Jerusalem on the same day, while Jesus and His disciples stopped at Bethany. This halt is not mentioned by the Synoptics; there is no reason for calling it in question. Very often one or two of the Synoptics present before us similar vacancies, which can only be filled by the aid of the third. Twice, a case of this kind is presented in the narrative of the following days: Mark xi. 11-15 informs us that one night elapsed between the entry on Palm-day and the expulsion of the traders; we should not suppose this interval when reading the accounts of Matthew and Luke. According to Mark. xi. 12, 20, a day and a night passed between the cursing of the fig-tree and the conversation of Jesus with His disciples on the subject, while in reading Matthew one would suppose that this conversation followed the miracle immediately. These apparent contradictions arise from the fact that, in the traditional teaching, the moral and religious importance of the facts by far outweighs their chronological interest. If such is the relation of the Synoptical nar-

<sup>1</sup> The words  $\sigma$  τεθνηκως (*the dead man*) which is read here by T. R., with 14 Mj., the Mm.

Italique Cop. etc., are omitted by  $\aleph$  B L X  
Italiq Syr. Tisch. (8th ed.).

ratives to each other, in spite of their general parallelism, it is not surprising that this phenomenon reappears, on a still greater scale, in the relation between the Synoptics and the fourth Gospel, which is absolutely independent of the tradition.

The *ὄν*, therefore, is connected with xi. 55: "*The Passover of the Jews was near.*" The turn of expression  $\pi\rho\delta\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\xi\ \eta\mu.\ \tau.\ \pi.$ , *six days before . . .*, may be explained by a Latinism (*ante diem sextum calendas*) in which the preposition is transposed (*Bäumlein*); or perhaps the most natural explanation of this form of expression is the same as that of the construction xi. 18 (where it is applied to local distance). The determination of time (six days) is added, in the genitive, to the word which indicates the starting-point of the reckoning (the Passover); comp. Amos i. 1, LXX:  $\pi\rho\delta\ \delta\upsilon\omicron\ \epsilon\tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ , *two years before the earthquake* (Winer, § 61, 5). Jesus knew that He would have need of all this time to make a last and striking impression on the minds of the people of the capital. On what day, according to this expression, are we to place the arrival of Jesus at Bethany? The answers are very different in consequence of the uncertainty in which writers find themselves respecting the following points: 1. Are we, or not, to include either the day of the arrival at Bethany or the first day of the Passover in the *six days* mentioned? 2. Must the first day of the Passover be fixed, in the language of John, on the 15th, as the first great Sabbath day of the Paschal week, or already on the 14th, as the day of preparation on which the lamb was sacrificed? Finally, 3. Must Friday (which is certainly the day of the week on which Jesus was put to death) be regarded as the 15th of Nisan of that year (according to the meaning ordinarily attributed to the Synoptics), or as the 14th, the day of the preparation (according to the meaning which most give—rightly, as it appears to me—to the narrative of John)? It is impossible to pursue in detail the manifold solutions to which these different possibilities give occasion. The summary result is the following: Some (*Tholuck, Lange, Wieseler, Hengstenberg, Luthardt, Lichtenstein, Keil*) place the arrival of Jesus at Bethany on Friday, a week before the Friday on which Jesus died; others (*Meyer, Ewald, Weiss*) on Saturday, the Sabbath which preceded the Passion; others (*de Wette, Hase, Andreae*, etc.) on Sunday, the next day; finally, *Hilgenfeld, Bauer, Scholten, Bäumlein*, on Monday. Among these possible different suppositions, that which appears to me, at this time, the most probable, is that set forth by *Andreae*, in the excellent essay entitled: *Der Todestag Jesu* (in the *Beweis des Glaubens*, July and Sept., 1870). The sixth of the days mentioned in ver. 1 is Friday, the day of Jesus' death, that is, according to the very clear meaning of the chronology of John (see the detailed treatment of this whole question at the end of chap. xix.), the 14th of Nisan, or the day of the preparation of the Passover of that year. It would follow from this that the day of the arrival at Bethany was Sunday, the 9th of Nisan, at evening. Jesus, after having passed Saturday (Sabbath) at Jericho at the house of Zacchæus, went up on the next day, Sunday, with the caravan from Jericho to Bethany, where he stopped, leaving the others to continue their journey to Jerusa-

lem, and it was on the evening of the same day that the banquet was offered to Him which is about to be related. The next day, Monday, the solemn entrance into Jerusalem took place.

In my first edition, I left out the 14th (Friday, the day of Jesus' death) from the *six days*, as already included in the Passover feast. In fact, this day plays the principal part in the story of the institution of the Passover in Exodus (chap. xii.), and Josephus (*Antiq.* xii., 15, 1) counts eight feast days, which shows that he includes the 14th. But, on the other hand, we must recognize that there is a difference between the feast of *unleavened bread* and the feast of *the Passover* properly so called: if the former necessarily included the 14th, on which the leaven was removed from the Israelitish houses, the latter did not properly begin until the 15th, to end on the 21st, these two days having the Sabbatical character and forming the beginning and ending of the Paschal week. Then another difficulty in this way of counting is, that in starting, in the count of six days, from Thursday the 13th, and in going back from that day, we come to Saturday as the day of the journey from Jericho to Bethany. Now, it cannot be admitted that Jesus made so long a journey on the Sabbath. *Meyer*, to escape this consequence, holds that Jesus had passed the night in a place quite near to Bethany, in order that He might be able to reach there the next day without violating the Sabbath ordinance, according to which one could not make a journey on that day of more than twenty minutes. But why, in that case, did He not arrange so as to reach Bethany also on that evening? And, besides, there was no place where one could stop between Jericho and Bethany. I had proposed a somewhat different solution, which seems to me now to be that of *Weiss*: Jesus had made most of the journey from Jericho to Bethany on Friday, but He arrived only at the earliest hour on Saturday (from six to seven o'clock in the evening); and thus this Saturday was indeed the *first of the six days before the feast*. The feast was not offered Him until the next day at evening, towards the end of this Sabbath; the next day but one, Sunday, He made His entry into Jerusalem. This combination, however, is far less simple than that which has been proposed by *Andree*; and how could the rest of the caravan which was going to Jerusalem have still made their journey from Bethany to Jerusalem without violating the Sabbatic prescription?

According to *Hilgenfeld*, *Baur*, etc., who take the 15th as the starting-point for the calculation, and include that day in the six, the arrival at Bethany took place on Monday, the 10th of Nisan. According to some of these interpreters, the evangelist sought by this date to establish a typical relation between the arrival of Jesus and the Jewish custom of setting apart the Paschal lamb on the 10th of Nisan. Such an intention would evidently compromise the historical character of our narrative. But this alleged relation between the arrival of Jesus and the setting apart of the lamb, is not in any way indicated in the narrative; and the idea of this comparison could not have entered the minds of the Greek Christians for whom the author designed his work.

Vv. 2, 3. "Therefore they made him a feast there, and Martha served; but

Lazarus was one of those<sup>1</sup> who were at table with him.<sup>2</sup> 3. Mary therefore, having taken a pound of ointment of pure nard, which was of great price, anointed the feet of Jesus with it and wiped his feet with her hair; and the whole house was filled with the odor of the ointment." When did this supper take place? Of course, according to our hypothesis, on Sunday evening, the day of Jesus' arrival. The subject of *εποίησαν*, they made, is indefinite; this form answers in Greek to the French *on*. Hence it already follows that this subject cannot be, as is ordinarily represented: the members of the family of Lazarus. Moreover, this appears from the express mention of the presence of Lazarus and of the activity of service on Martha's part, all of them circumstances which would be self-evident if the supper had taken place in their own house. As the undetermined subject of the verb can only be the persons named afterwards, it follows that they are, much rather, the people of the place. A part of the inhabitants of Bethany feel the desire of testifying their thankfulness to Him who by a glorious miracle had honored their obscure village. It is this connection of ideas which seems to be expressed by the *therefore* at the beginning of ver. 2, and, immediately afterwards, by this detail: "*Lazarus, whom he had raised from the dead.*" That which, no doubt, very specially impelled them to render to Jesus, at this moment, this public homage, was the hatred to which they saw Him exposed on the part of the rulers. This feast was a courageous response to the edict of the Sanhedrim (xi. 57); it was the proscribed one whom they honored.

The text does not tell us in what house the supper took place. Lazarus being there as a guest, not as host (ver. 2), it follows that the scene occurred in another house than his own. Thus is the harmony very naturally established with the narrative of Matthew and Mark, who state positively that the supper took place in the house of Simon the leper, a sick man, no doubt, whom Jesus had healed and who has claimed the privilege of receiving him in the name of all. It is inconceivable that this very simple reconciliation should appear to Meyer a mere process of false harmonistics. Weiss himself says: "The form of expression used excludes the idea that Lazarus was the one who gave the supper." Every one could not receive Jesus: but every one had desired to contribute, according to his means, to the homage which was rendered to Him: the people of Bethany, by the banquet offered in their name; Martha, by giving her personal service, even in the house of another person; Lazarus, by his presence, which in itself alone glorified the Master more than all that the others could do; finally, Mary, by a royal prodigality, which was alone capable of expressing the sentiment which inspired her.

The general custom among the ancient nations was to anoint with perfume the heads of guests on feast-days. "*Thou preparedst the table before me; thou anointest my head with oil; my cup overflows,*" says David to Jehovah, when describing under the figure of a feast which his

<sup>1</sup> **BL** It. Vulg. read *εκ* before *των ανακειμενων*.

Mnn. only. All the Mjj.: *ανακειμενων συρ αυτω*.

<sup>2</sup> T. R.; *συνακειμενων αυτω* with some

God gives to him the delights of communion with Him (Ps. xxiii. 5). The forgetting of this ceremony is noticed by Jesus (Luke vii. 46), as an offensive omission. At Bethany such a mistake was not committed; it was Mary who charged herself with this office, reserving to herself the accomplishment of it in her own way. *Μίρον* is the generic term which comprehends all the liquid perfumes, and *νάρδος*, *nard*, the name of the most precious kind. This word, of Sanskrit origin (in Persian *nard*, in Sanskrit *nalada*), denotes a plant which grows in India, and of which some less celebrated varieties are found in Syria. The juice was enclosed in flasks of alabaster (*nardi ampullae*), and it was used not only to anoint the body, but also to perfume wine. (See Riehm, *Handwörterb.*) We have translated *πιστικός* by *pure*. This word, which is unknown in classic Greek, is not again found in the entire New Testament, except in the corresponding passage in Mark. Among the later Greeks, it serves to designate a person *worthy of confidence*; thus the one to whom the care of a vessel or a flock is committed. It signifies, therefore, nard on which one can rely, not adulterated. This meaning is the more suitable, since nard was subjected to all sorts of adulterations. Pliny enumerates nine plants by means of which it could be counterfeited, and Tibullus uses the expression *nardus pura*, which almost gives to our *πιστικής*, in Mark and John, the character of a technical epithet. The meaning *drinkable* (from *πινω*, *πιπίσκω*) is much less probable, not only because the natural form would be *πιστός*, or *ποτιμός*, but especially because the notion of potableness has no relation to the context. The attempt has also been made to derive this word from the name of a Persian city, *Pisteira*, a name which was sometimes abridged to *Pistu* (comp. Meyer on Mark xiv. 2). This is a worthless expedient (comp. *Hengstenberg* and especially *Lücke* and *Wichelhaus*). The epithet, *πολυτίμου*, *very costly*, can only refer to the first of the two substantives (in opposition to *Luthardt*, *Weiss*, etc.); for it was not the plant which had been purchased (*νάρδου*), but the perfume (*μίρον*). *λίτρα*, a pound, answers to the Latin *libra*, and denotes a weight of twelve ounces; it was an enormous quantity for a perfume of this price. But nothing must be wanting to the homage of Mary, neither the quality nor the quantity.

These flasks of nard hermetically sealed were probably received from the East; to use the contents of them, the neck must be broken; this is what Mary did, according to Mark (xiv. 3). This act having a somewhat striking character, she must have performed it in the sight of all the guests, consequently over the head of Jesus already seated at the table. His head thus received the first fruits of the perfume (comp. Matt. and Mark: "she poured it on his head"). Only after this, as no ordinary guest was here in question, and as Mary wished to give to her guest not merely a testimony of love and respect, but a mark of adoration, she joined with the ordinary anointing of the head (which was self evident; comp. Ps. xxiii. 5; Luke vii. 46) an altogether exceptional homage. As if this precious liquid were only common water, she pours it over His feet, and in such abundance that it was as if she were bathing them with

it; so she is obliged to wipe them. For this purpose she uses her own hair. This last fact carries the homage to a climax. It was among the Jews, according to *Lightfoot* (IL, p. 633), "a disgrace for a woman to loosen the fillets which bound up her hair and to appear with disheveled hair."<sup>1</sup> Mary bears witness, therefore, by this means that, as no sacrifice is too costly for her purse, so no service is too mean for her person. All that she *is* belongs to Him, as well as all that she *has*. We may understand thus the ground of the repetition, certainly not accidental, of the words *τοὺς ποδᾶς αὐτοῦ, his feet*. To this, the least noble part of His body it is, that she renders this extraordinary homage. Every detail in this narrative breathes adoration, the soul of the act. Perhaps the report of the homage rendered to Jesus by the sinful woman of Galilee had reached Mary. She was unwilling that the friends of Jesus should do less for Him than a stranger.

The identity of this event with that which is related in Matt. xxvi. 6-13, and Mark xiv. 3-9, is indisputable. It is said, no doubt, in the latter passages, that the perfume was poured on *the head*, in John, on *the feet*; but, as we have just seen, this slight difference is easily explained. After the anointing in the ordinary form (that of the head), this *bathing of the feet* with perfume began, which here takes the place of the ordinary bathing of the feet (Luke vii. 44). John alone has preserved the recollection of this fact which gives to the scene its unique character. It cannot be supposed that Mary poured on the head of Jesus a whole pound of liquid. As to the place which this story occupies in the two narratives, it constitutes no more serious objection against the identity of the event. For in the Synoptics the place is evidently determined by the *moral* relation of this act to the fact related immediately afterwards, the treachery of Judas (Matt. xv. 14-16; Mark xv. 10, 11). This association of ideas had determined the uniting of the two facts in the oral tradition, and from this it had passed into the written redaction. John has restored the fact to its own place. The relation of the anointing of Jesus at Bethany with the event related in Luke vii. is entirely different. We have already mentioned the points which do not allow us to identify the two narratives (p. 171). *Keim* declares that a homage of this kind cannot have occurred twice. But the anointing belonged necessarily, as well as the bathing of the feet, to every meal to which there was an invitation (Luke vii. 44). The details in which the two scenes resemble each other are purely accidental. *Simon the leper* of Bethany, of whom Matthew and Mark speak, has nothing in common with *Simon the Pharisee*, of whom Luke speaks, except the name. Now, among the small number of persons with whom we are acquainted in the Gospel history taken alone, we can count twelve or thirteen Simons; and can there not have been two men, bearing this so common name, in whose houses these two similar scenes may have taken place? The one lived in Judea, the other in Galilee; the one receives Jesus into his house in the course of His Galilean ministry; the other, a few days before the Passion. The discussion in Galilee has reference to

<sup>1</sup> *Sotah*, fol. 5, i. "The priest unties the hair of the suspected woman. . . as a mark of disgrace." *Vajicra Rabba*, fol. 188. 2. "Kamith, who had had seven sons high-

priests, answered those who asked her to what she owed such an honor: 'To the fact that the beams of my chamber have never seen the hairs of my head.'"

the pardon of sins; in Judea, to the prodigality of Mary. And if the two women wiped the feet of Jesus with their hair, in the case of the one, it is the tears which she gathers up, in that of the other, it is a perfume with which she has embalmed her Master. This difference sufficiently marks the two women and the two scenes. Christian feeling, moreover, will always protest against the identification of Mary of Bethany with a woman of bad morals.

Vv. 4-6. "Then<sup>1</sup> one of his disciples, Judas, the son of Simon, the Iscariot,<sup>2</sup> he who was soon to betray him, says: 5. Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred denarii and the price given to the poor? 6. Now this he said, not that he cared for the poor, but because he was a thief, and kept<sup>3</sup> the purse and took what was put therein." This outbreak of indignation on the part of Judas is occasioned by the mean passion with which the evangelist charges him; but, like his treachery, it has a deeper source than avarice. For a long time (vi. 70) there had been in this heart a gloomy discontent with respect to the course followed by Jesus (vi. 70, 71; comp. with ver. 15), and this feeling only waited for a pretext to manifest itself. In the Synoptics, it is *the disciples* (Matthew), *some* (Mark), who protest. It seems that on this occasion, as on others, Judas played among his fellow-disciples the part of the leaven which leavens the whole mass. *Westcott* says: "He expressed what the others thought." There is no doubt more than this: he excited among them a movement of discontent which would not have been awakened without him. We find here again a relation between John and the Synoptics which we have already pointed out in other stories. In the latter, the outlines are effaced: the former alone reproduces the characteristic features, as we might expect from a witness. Judas knows the exact price of the commodity in question, as if he were a tradesman. For the value of the denarius, see on vi. 7. The sum indicated was nearly equivalent, in the time of the emperors, to two hundred and sixty francs. It is found as identically the same sum in Mark. We have already remarked several similar coincidences between the two evangelists (ver. 3; vi. 7, 10). Even independently of the subsequent fact of the treachery of Judas, attested by the four evangelists, it would be very rash to ascribe the accusation here formulated by John against Judas to a feeling of personal hatred, as modern criticism has allowed itself to do. The word *γλωσσόκομον* (properly *γλωσσοκομῆιον*) denotes literally the *case* in which musicians kept the mouth-pieces of flutes; whence: box. This purse was probably a small portable cash-box. The property of Jesus and His disciples was mingled with that of the poor (xiii. 29). This fund was supplied by voluntary gifts (ver. 5; Luke viii. 1-3). We may see in xx. 15 how in the word *βαστάζειν*, the sense of *bearing*, the only one used, in general, in the New Testament, is easily changed into that of *taking away*, *purling* (*de Wette, Meyer*). The simple meaning to *bear* is not impos-

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  B read *δε* instead of *οὖν*.

<sup>2</sup> Many variants in the designation of Judas.  
 $\aleph$  B L: *Ιουδας ο Ισκαριωτης*; T. R. with 10  
 Mjj. (A I K etc.): *Ιουδ. Σιμωνος Ισκαριωτης*;

D: *Ιουδ. απο Καρωτων*, etc.

<sup>3</sup> Instead of *ειχεν και* (*he had and*),  $\aleph$  B L Q:  
*εχων* (*having*).

sible, however, if, with the Alexandrian authorities, we read *ἔχων*, *having*, instead of *καὶ . . . εἶχε*, *and he had . . . and*. . . For by this means all tautology as between this clause and the following disappears. But it is absurd, in any case, to claim that the sense of *taking away* is excluded because of the article *τά* before *βαλλόμενα*, as if this article must signify that he took away *everything* which was placed in the box! It has been asked why Jesus, if He knew Judas, intrusted to him this office so perilous to his morality. We will not say, with *Hengstenberg*, that Jesus saw fit thus to call forth the manifestation of his sin, as the only means of accomplishing a cure. By such a course of action, Jesus would have put Himself, as it seems to us, in the place of God more completely than was accordant with the reality of His humanity. But is there clear proof that Jesus intervened directly in the choice of Judas as the treasurer of the company? Might not this have been an arrangement which the disciples had made among themselves and in which Jesus had not desired to mingle. *Weiss* thinks that Jesus had chosen Judas at first because he had a special gift in the financial sphere, and that afterwards He did not wish to interfere with a relation in which He recognized a divine dispensation.

Vv. 7, 8. "*Jesus therefore said to him: Let her alone; she has kept it for the day of my burial.*" 8. *For the poor you have always with you; but me you have not always.*"<sup>2</sup> We translate according to the reading of the T. R. which alone seems to us admissible. The imperative *ἄφες* is absolute: "*Let her alone* (in peace); cease to disturb her by thy observations." The reason is given afterwards. With the Alexandrian variant, *ἄφες* has for its object the following clause, either in the sense given by the *Vulgate*, *Meyer*, *Bäumlein*, etc. "Let her keep *this* (*αὐτό*, the remainder of the ointment of which she had poured out only a part) to embalm me on the day of my death,"—or in that given by *Bengel*, *Lange*, *Luthardt*, *Weiss*, *Keil*: "Allow her to *have reserved* this ointment for this day, which, by the act which she has done with respect to me, becomes, as it were, that of an anticipated burial." This last sense is grammatically inadmissible. The expression *ἄφέναι ἵνα*, *to allow*, necessarily refers to the future, not to the past. With that meaning, why not say quite simply: *ἄφες αὐτὴν τηρηκέαι*? How are we to understand that *Weiss* justifies so forced an explanation by asserting that there was no other way of expressing this idea? The meaning given by *Meyer* is still more impossible. By what right can we suppose that only a part of the ointment had been poured out; that there was a remainder, and that it is this remainder which is designated by *αὐτό*? Moreover, when thus understood, the words of Jesus no longer form an answer to the objection of Judas. The latter had not disputed Mary's right to keep the whole or a part of this ointment for the purpose of using it in the future on a more suitable occasion; quite the contrary; that which he charged against her was that she had wasted and not kept it. We must acknowledge therefore with *Lücke* and *Hengstenberg*, that,

<sup>1</sup> T. R. reads with 12 Mjj. (A I Γ etc.), the Min. Συγ<sup>ε</sup>sb: *ἄφες αὐτὴν. εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τ. ενταφ. μου τηρηκεν αὐτο.* Ⲙ B D K L Q X II 4 Mnn

Ἰπ<sup>ε</sup>ρ<sup>ε</sup>ρ<sup>ε</sup>ισ<sup>ε</sup> Vulg. Cop.: *ἄφες αὐτὴν ἵνα εἰς τὴν ἡμ. τ. ενταφ. μου τηρησῆ αὐτο.*  
<sup>2</sup> D omits ver. 8.

however this reading is interpreted, it offers no tolerable meaning. It is an unhappy correction from the hands of critics who thought that the embalming of a man did not take place before his death. The received reading, on the contrary, offers a simple and delicate sense. Jesus ascribes to the act of Mary precisely that which was wanting to the view of Judas, a purpose, a practical utility. "It is not for nothing, as thou chargest her, that she has poured out this ointment. She has to-day anticipated my embalming;" comp. Mark xiv. 8: "She has been beforehand in embalming my body for my burial;" in other terms: She has made this day the day of my funeral rites of which thou wilt soon give the signal. *Ἐνταφιασμὸς*: the embalming and, in general, the preparations for burial. The word *τετήρηκεν*, *she has kept*, is full of delicacy. It is as if there had been here on Mary's part a contrived plan and one in harmony with the utilitarianism on which the reproach of Judas rested.

Can ver. 8, which is wanting in D, have been introduced here by the copyists from the text of the two Synoptics, and can this manuscript alone be right as against all the other documents? It is more probable that it is one of those faulty omissions which are so frequent in D. The sense is: "If the poor are really the object of your solicitude, there will always be opportunity to exercise your liberality towards them; but my person will soon be taken away from the assiduous care of your love." The first clause seems to contain an allusion to Deut. xv. 11. The present *ἔχετε*, *you have*, in the first clause, is owing to the *πάντοτε*, *always*, and the following present is introduced by the first.

*Beyschlag* correctly observes respecting this passage: "It is asserted that the fourth evangelist likes to depreciate the Twelve; but why then does he, and he alone, place all to the account of Judas?" It is further said: He has a special hatred to Judas. This is to affirm beyond question the authenticity of the Gospel; for what writer of the second century could have cherished a personal hatred against Judas? Let us also remark that the slight modifications which John introduces into the Synoptic narrative are perfectly insignificant from the standpoint of the *idea* of the Logos. They can only be explained by the more distinct knowledge which he has of the fact and by the more thoroughly historical character of the whole representation. We see, finally, how false is the *idea* of *dependence* with relation to the narrative of Mark, which *Weizsäcker* attributes to the fourth evangelist, by reason of the three hundred denarii which are common to the two accounts and the coincidences in expressions (*Untersuch.*, p. 290). The superiority of the narrative of John shows its independence.

Vv. 9-11. "A great multitude therefore of the Jews learned that he was there; and they came, not because of Jesus only, but that they might see Lazarus also whom he had raised from the dead. 10. But the chief priests took counsel that they might put Lazarus also to death, 11 because many of the Jews went away and believed on Jesus." The pilgrims who came from Jericho with Jesus, on arriving at Jerusalem, had spread abroad the report of His approach. And all those inhabitants of the country region of Judea, of whom men-

tion has been made in xi. 55, 56, and who made Jesus, already many days before His arrival, the subject of their conversation, on learning that He is sojourning so near them, could not restrain their impatience to see Him, as well as Lazarus, the living monument of His power. The term *Jews* preserves here the sense which it has throughout the whole Gospel: the representatives of the old order of things. This was precisely the poignant thing for the rulers; the very people on whom they had always counted to make head against the people of Galilee, the inhabitants of Judea and even those of Jerusalem, began to fall away. Ὑπάγειν, *to go away*, but without noise. In this new attitude and particularly in these visits to Bethany some precautions were taken. Thus is the way prepared for the solemn entrance of Jesus into Jerusalem. The people are altogether disposed to an ovation. It only needs that Jesus should give a signal and give loose rein to the enthusiasm of the multitude, that the hour of the royal manifestation may strike, which had been so long desired by His mother (ii. 4) and demanded by His brethren (vii. 4), but had been until now refused by Him.

II.—*The entrance into Jerusalem*: vv. 12-19.

Jesus had striven on every occasion to repress the popular manifestations in His favor (vi. 15; Luke xiv. 25-33; xix. 11 ff., etc.). Now He allows free play to the feelings of the multitude and surrenders Himself to the public homage which is prepared for Him. What precautions had He still to take? Ought He not once at least in His life to be acknowledged and saluted in His character of King of Israel? In any case, the hour of His death was near; that of His royal advent had therefore sounded.

The tradition of the Christian Church fixes the entrance of Jesus into Jerusalem on the Sunday which preceded the Passion. The most probable explanation of ver. 1 has not confirmed this view; it was probably Monday. Three of the evangelists do not speak of the time of day when this event occurred. Why then may we not connect our view with the one who positively indicates it? This one is Mark. He says, xi. 11: "*And Jesus entered into Jerusalem and into the temple; and, having looked round about upon all things, as it was already late, he went away to Bethany with the Twelve.*" These words imply that, after having entered into Jerusalem, Jesus did nothing further of importance on that day, because the hour was already too late. Hence it follows that the entrance took place during the second half of the day. How is it possible to call this a harmonistic conclusion, as *Weiss* does? Does John say anything contrary to this narrative of Mark?

Vv. 12, 13. "*The next day, a great multitude of persons who had come<sup>1</sup> to the feast, having heard that Jesus was coming to Jerusalem took branches of palm-trees<sup>2</sup> and went forth to meet him,<sup>2</sup> and they cried,<sup>3</sup> Hosanna! Blessed*

<sup>1</sup> ⲛ Δ omit ο before ελθων.

<sup>3</sup> ⲛ D L Q; εκραυγασον instead of εκραζον

<sup>2</sup> A K U Π 50 Mnn. read απαντησιν instead of υπατησιν (11 Mjj.). D G L X; συνατησιν.

ⲛ A D K Q X Π add λεγοντες,

*be he that cometh in the name of the Lord, the king of Israel!*" This multitude is much more considerable than that of which mention was made in vv. 9-11; it included most of the pilgrims of all countries who *had come to the feast*. They had heard from those who had gone to Bethany on the preceding evening, that Jesus was really there and that He was Himself preparing to come to Jerusalem. They went forth, therefore, in large numbers to meet Him, and to form a body of attendants on His entrance into the city. Those who started earliest went even to Bethany; the rest must have successively met Him on the road. Thus, in proportion as He advanced, already surrounded by many disciples and friends, He found from place to place joyous groups on the way. Hence an easy explanation is given of the ovation of this day, which, in the Synoptic narrative, has a somewhat abrupt character and remains in a certain degree inexplicable. Not having mentioned the stay of Jesus at Bethany, the other gospels naturally represent Him as entering into the city with the caravan of pilgrims who come with Him from Jericho.

All at once an inspiration of celestial joy passes over this multitude. Their rejoicing and their hopes break forth in songs and significant symbols. Luke, in particular, admirably describes this moment: "*And as he drew near from the descent of the Mount of Olives, the whole multitude of the disciples began to rejoice and praise God for all the miracles which they had seen*" (xix. 37). John gives us to understand what was the one among all these miracles which played the greatest part in the enthusiasm of the multitude and which had produced this very general effect both on those who accompanied and on those who met the Lord: namely, the resurrection of Lazarus.—The palm, by reason of the permanent beauty of its magnificent crown of leaves, is the emblem not only of strength, beauty and joy, but also of salvation (see *Keil*). In 1 Macc. xiii. 51, Simon returns to Jerusalem *with songs and branches of palm-trees, to the sound of the harp and of cymbals, because the enemy was driven out of Israel*. In Lev. xxiii. 40, in the institution of the feast of Tabernacles, it is said: "*Ye shall take . . . branches of palm-trees . . . , and ye shall rejoice seven days before the Lord.*" On each day during this last feast a procession, in which branches of palm-trees were carried, was made around the altar of burnt-offering; comp. Apoc. vii. 9. On this day all was done spontaneously. An allusion has been found in the articles  $\tau\acute{\alpha}$  and  $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$  before  $\beta\alpha\iota\alpha$  and  $\phi\omicron\upsilon\nu\acute{\iota}\kappa\omega\nu$  (*the branches of the palm-trees*) to the branches which were well-known by tradition and which gave the name to the day; it is more simple to understand by them: "The branches of the palm-trees which were found on the road," as if John had said: Having stripped *the* palm-trees of *their* branches. The term  $\beta\alpha\iota\omicron\nu$  already in itself means *branch of the palm-tree*. But the complement  $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu \phi\omicron\upsilon\nu\acute{\iota}\kappa\omega\nu$  is added by John for the readers who were not acquainted with the technical term.

The cries of the multitude, as well as the terms: *son of David* (*Matt.*), *King of Israel* (*John*), leave no doubt as to the meaning of this manifestation; it was certainly the Messiah whom the people intended to salute in the person of Jesus. The acclamations reported by John (ver. 13), the

equivalent of which is found in the Synoptics, are taken from the 118th Psalm, particularly from vv. 25, 26. It was probably a chant composed for the inauguration of the second temple, and the quoted words refer to the procession received by the priests on its arrival at the temple. Numerous Rabbinical citations prove that this Psalm was regarded as Messianic. Every Israelite knew these words by heart: they were sung at the feast of Tabernacles, in the procession which was made around the altar, and at the Passover in the chant of the great Hallel (Ps. cxiii.-cxviii.) during the Paschal supper. *Hosanna* (from *הוֹשִׁיעָה נָא*, *save, I pray thee*) is a prayer addressed to God by the theocratic people on behalf of His Messiah-King; it is, if we may venture to use the expression, the Israelitish *God save the King*. It seems to us more natural to refer the words *in the name of the Lord* to the verb *comes*, than to the participle *blessed*. The expression: *He that comes in the name of the Lord*, designates in a general way, and still quite vaguely, the divine messenger *par excellence*, on whose person and work Israel implores the benedictions of heaven; then there comes after this the great word whose import every one understands, the by no means equivocal term *King of Israel*. Of course, all in this multitude did not cry out exactly in the same way; this explains the differences in the popular acclamations reported by the evangelists. As in vi. 5, Jesus had seen in the arrival of the multitudes in the desert the call of His Father to give a feast to His people, so in the impetuosity of the multitude who hasten towards Him with these triumphal acclamations, He recognizes a divine signal; He understands that, in accordance with the words of the very Psalm from which the people borrow their songs, this is "*the day which the Lord has made, and we must rejoice in it*" (Ps. cxviii. 24); and he responds to the salutation of the people by a true Messianic sigh.

Vv. 14, 15. "*Jesus, having found a young ass; sat thereon, according as it is written, 15. Fear not, daughter<sup>1</sup> of Zion; behold, thy king cometh seated on an ass's colt.*" The conduct of Jesus is ordered by the nature of things. Since He wishes to-day to accept this homage, He cannot remain mingled with the multitude. On the one hand, He must in some sort put Himself on the scene; but, on the other, He wishes to do it only in the most humble way and in the way most appropriate to the spiritual nature of His royalty. In the ancient times, the ass does not seem to have been in Israel a despised animal; comp. Judg. v. 9, 10; x. 4; 2 Sam. xvii. 23. Later, the horse and the mule were preferred to it; comp. Sirach, xxxiii. (xxxvi.) 25 (24). The prophet Zechariah himself indicates the meaning which he here attaches to this symbol, when he says (ix. 9): "*Behold thy king cometh unto thee just, having salvation and humble.*" The young ass represents for him the humility of the Messiah and consequently the peaceful nature of His kingdom: "*I will cut off the chariots of war . . . and the king shall speak peace unto the nations*" (Zech. ix 10). The two ideas of humility and of peace are closely connected, as, on the other hand, are those of wealth and military power. The expression *εὑρών*, *having found*,

<sup>1</sup>T. R. with 8 Mj. (8 E G etc.): θυγατερ; 9 Mj. (A B D etc); θυγατηρ.

seems at the first glance incompatible with the narrative of the Synoptics, according to which Jesus sends two of His disciples with the express order to bring Him the young ass. But *εἰρῶν* does not signify: having found *without seeking*; witness the *εὕρηκα* of Archimedes! This word may be translated by: *having procured for Himself*, as in the expressions *εὕρισκων δόξαν, κέρδος, βίον*, to procure glory, gain, subsistence for oneself (see Passow). Nothing, therefore, can be inferred from this term as to the *how* of this finding, and it is natural to suppose that John, in this summary expression, sums up the narrative of the Synoptics, which was sufficiently well-known in the Church. He also abridges the quotation of Zechariah; for it concerns him only to establish the general relation between the prophecy and its accomplishment. The expression *daughter of Zion* designates the population of the city personified. John substitutes: *Fear not*, for the *Rejoice* of the prophecy; it is the same sentiment, but somewhat less strongly expressed: "Fear not; a king who comes thus cannot be a tyrant." If Jesus had never entered into Jerusalem in this way, this prophecy would nevertheless have been realized. His entire ministry in Israel was the fulfillment of it. But, by realizing *to the very letter* the figure employed by the prophet, Jesus desired to render more sensible the spiritual and true accomplishment of the prophecy. Everything, however, occurred so simply, so naturally, that, at the moment, the disciples did not think of the prophecy and did not grasp its relation to that which had just taken place.

Ver. 16. "Now the disciples did not understand these things at the moment; but when Jesus had been glorified, then they remembered that these things were written of him and that they had done these things to him." It was only afterwards, when after the ascension, and when enlightened by the Holy Spirit, they retraced the earthly life of their Master, that they discerned the meaning of this event and recognized in it the fulfillment of a prophecy. In the light of the heavenly elevation of Jesus, they understood this fact which had prefigured it (*these things*). There is, therefore, no reason to turn aside from the natural sense of *ἔδοξάσθη*, *was glorified*, and to refer this term, as *Reuss* does, to the death of Jesus, as the transition to His exaltation. What a charlatan the pseudo-John of *Baur*, who, by means of this want of understanding invented by him, would give himself the appearance of having himself been one of these disciples whom the ascension had enlightened! We are surprised at the expression "*that they had done these things to him*"; for, in the scene related by John, the apostles had done nothing to Jesus. So many take *ἐποίησαν* in the sense in which it is found in ver. 2: "*They* (indefinite) *had done to him*," and assign as subject to this verb *the multitude* (vv. 12, 13). But the subject of *they had done* cannot be different from that of *they understood* and *they remembered*. John wished to set forth precisely the fact that the disciples understood afterwards what they had done *themselves* in the fulfillment of a prophecy of which no one of them dreamed. The co-operation of the disciples, indicated by John, is described in detail in Luke xix. 29-36 and the parallels. We find here a new proof of the abridged character of his narrative

and his thoroughly conscious relation to the narrative of the Synoptics. We see from the words: *they had done these things to him*, how arbitrary is the idea of *Keim*, according to which John's narrative tends to make the disciples and Jesus passive in this scene, and this because the author wished to give utterance to his repugnance to the idea of the Jewish Messiah!

Vv. 17, 18. "*The multitude therefore who were with him when<sup>1</sup> he called Lazarus out of the tomb and raised him from the dead bore witness to him; 18 and it was for this cause also<sup>2</sup> that the multitude went to meet him, because they had heard that he had done this miracle.*" John does not have it as his aim to present the complete picture of the entrance of Jesus, but rather to show the double relation of this event to the resurrection of Lazarus (its cause), on the one hand, and to the condemnation of Jesus (its effect), on the other. It is this connection which he brings out in vv. 17-19. If *ὄτι*, *that*, is read in ver. 17 with five Mjj. and the most ancient translations, the meaning is: that by coming forward the multitude bore testimony that He had caused the resurrection of Lazarus. There is nothing in this case to prevent the multitude of ver. 18 from being the same as that of ver. 17. John would simply say that the miracle which they were celebrating by accompanying Jesus (ver. 17) was the same one which had induced them to come to meet him (ver. 18). But the reflection of ver. 18 is, with this meaning, an idle one. It is self-evident that the event which they celebrated is also that which made them hasten to Him. If *ὄτε* (*when*) is read, with the most ancient Mjj., it is quite otherwise. John relates that the multitude which had been with Jesus at the tomb of Lazarus, and which had been present at his resurrection, by accompanying Jesus bore testimony to this great miracle of which they had themselves been witnesses. And here are the true authors of the ovation of Palm-day. They were there relating to the numerous pilgrims who were strangers what they had themselves heard and seen. We thus understand better this dramatic amplification, which in the former reading makes the effect quite prolix: *When he called Lazarus out of the tomb and raised him from the dead*. The mere mention of the fact, with the *ὄτι*, would have been sufficient. If *ὄτε* (*when*) is read, the participle *ὁ ὢν* is an imperfect: "who was with him when . . ." xi. 42.

In the 18th verse, John speaks of the second multitude—the one which came to meet Jesus on the road to Bethany. The *διὰ τοῦτο*, *for this cause*, refers to the following *ὄτι*, *because*. And it was *for this* that the multitude came to meet Him, to wit, *because*. Not only did this miracle form the principal subject of the conversations of those who came; but it was *also* (*καί*) this same miracle, which, having come to the knowledge of the whole multitude of pilgrims, impelled them to go and meet Him. The comparison of the words of Luke (xix. 37) which we have already cited, shows that which we have so often established: how frequently the outlines of

<sup>1</sup> *ὄτε* (*when*) is the reading of the T. R. (56) while D E K L Itplerique Syr. and 5 read *ὄτι* with X A B C H M Q S U T Δ A 100 Mnn., (*that*).

<sup>2</sup> B E H Δ A omit *καί*.

the Synoptic picture are vague and undecided as compared with the so distinctly marked features of the Johannean narrative.

Ver. 19. "*Whereupon the Pharisees said among themselves, You see that you prevail nothing; behold, the world is gone after him.*" Vv. 17, 18 bring out the influence of the resurrection of Lazarus on the scene of Palm-day; ver. 19 indicates that of this scene on the final catastrophe. Πρὸς ἑαυτοῖς, instead of πρὸς ἀλλήλους, because, belonging to the same body, it is as if they were speaking to *themselves*. Ἴδε, *behold*, alludes to the unexpected spectacle of which they had just been witnesses. There is something of distress in the term ὁ κόσμος, *the world*, "all this people, native and foreign," and in the aorist ἀπῆλθεν, *is gone*: "It is an accomplished thing; we are alone!"—θεωρεῖτε may be explained as an imperative; but it is better to take it as an indicative present. These persons mutually summon each other, with a kind of bitterness, to notice the inefficacy of their half-measures. It is a way of encouraging each other to use without delay the extreme measures advised by Caiaphas. It is these last words especially which serve to place this whole passage in connection with the general design of this part of the Gospel.

The more closely the narrative of John is studied, the less is it possible to see in it the accidental product of tradition or of legend. Instead of the juxtaposition of anecdotes which forms the character of the Synoptics, we meet at every step the traces of a profound connection which governs the narrative even in its minutest details. The dilemma is therefore, as *Baur* has clearly seen, real history profoundly apprehended and reproduced, or a romance very skillfully conceived and executed.

### III.—*The last scene in the temple: vv. 20–36.*

Of all the events which occurred between Palm-day and Thursday evening, the evening before the Passion, John mentions but one, which is omitted by the Synoptics: the attempt of a few Greek proselytes to approach Jesus and the discourse in which He expressed the feelings to which this unexpected circumstance gave rise in Him.

If John so specially sets forth this event, it is not in order to relate an event omitted by his predecessors; it is because it has according to him a peculiar importance, and is in direct connection with the purpose of his whole narrative. He had beheld in it, beyond the closing of the public activity of Jesus, the prelude to the agonies of the Passion. It is therefore an essential landmark in his narrative. He does not say at what moment this event must be placed. According to the words of Mark (xi. 11), it cannot have taken place on Palm-day. It issued, moreover, in the final rupture of Jesus with the people; and we know that, during the days which followed Palm-day, Jesus resided in the temple, as if in His palace, and exercised there a sort of Messianic sovereignty. The next day after His entrance into Jerusalem, Tuesday, Jesus purified the temple by the expulsion of the traders. The following day, Wednesday, He coped with the official authorities, who demanded an explanation as to the origin

of the power which He arrogated to Himself; then, successively, with the Pharisees, the Sadducees, the Scribes, who approached him with captious questions; and in His turn He presented to them, from Psalm ex., the great question of the divinity of the Messiah, which was to be the subject of His judicial sentence; then, after having pronounced the malediction upon the rulers of the people, He withdrew, towards evening, to the mount of Olives, where He displayed before the eyes of four of His disciples (Mark) the picture of the judgment of Jerusalem, of the Church, and of mankind. The last words of our narrative (ver. 36): "*Jesus said these things; then, departing he hid himself from them,*" may therefore lead us to suppose that the scene related by John occurred on this same Wednesday evening, at the moment when Jesus was leaving the temple to go to Bethany (comp. the solemn farewell, Matt. xxiii. 37-39). In this case, it must be supposed that Jesus did not return to Jerusalem on Thursday morning, at the time when all the people were expecting Him in the temple, and that He passed the whole of Thursday in retirement at Bethany. This might very well be indicated by the expression: *he hid himself from them*. But perhaps in this way Wednesday will be too full. It is possible also that Jesus returned again to Jerusalem for a few moments on Thursday morning; it would then be at that time that the scene here related by John took place. Nevertheless, the expression: *he hid himself from them*, is more easily justified on the first supposition.

Vv. 20-22. "*There were certain Greeks among those who went up to Jerusalem to worship at the feast, 21 who came to Philip, who was of Bethsaida in Galilee, and made this request of him: Sir, we desire to see Jesus. 22. Philip goes and finds Andrew and tells him; and Andrew and Philip tell it again<sup>1</sup> to Jesus.*" The Greeks belonged to the number of those heathen who, like the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts viii.), had in their own country embraced the Jewish religion and who had come to celebrate the great feasts in Jerusalem. They were not, as some have thought, Jews speaking Greek and dwelling among the heathen (*ἑλληρισταί*). The spacious court of the Gentiles was designed for these proselytes, according to the words of Solomon, 1 Kings viii. 41-43. If these strangers had been witnesses of the entrance of Jesus into Jerusalem and had been present at the driving out of the traders—that act by which Jesus had restored to its true use the only portion of the sanctuary which was open to them,—we may the more easily understand their desire to enter into a more intimate relation with such a man. Certainly, they did not desire merely, like Zacchæus (Luke xix. 3) to see Jesus with the bodily eye; which would limit the intervention of Philip to *showing* Him to them (*Brückner, Weiss*). The request, thus understood, would not give a ground for such a step with relation to Philip, nor for Philip's action as related to Andrew, and that of the two as related to Jesus, nor for the solemn reflections of the latter. What these Greeks desired was certainly to have a private conversation with Him on religious

<sup>1</sup> T. R. reads *καὶ πάλιν Ἀνδρέας καὶ Φίλιππος λεγούσιν* with 12 Mj. A B L: *ερχεται Ἀνδρ. κ. Φιλ. καὶ λεγούσιν*. N: *καὶ πάλιν ερχεται Ἀνδρ.*

κ. Φ. καὶ λεγούσιν. The Vss. also vary very much.

subjects. Who can tell even, whether, as witnesses of the opposition which Jesus encountered from the rulers of His nation, they may not have desired to invite Him to turn to the heathen, who could better appreciate than these narrow Jews did, a sage and teacher like Him. Ecclesiastical history (Euseb., i. 13) has preserved the memory of an embassy sent to Jesus by the King of Edessa, in Syria, to invite Him to come and fix His abode with him and to promise Him a royal welcome, which would compensate Him for the obstinacy of the Jews in rejecting Him. In the circumstance which occupies our attention we must recognize, with the disciples and with Jesus Himself (see what follows), one of the first manifestations of sympathy for the Gospel on the part of the heathen world, the first sign of the attractive power which His moral beauty was soon to exert upon the whole human race. Jesus, at the moment when this request was conveyed to Him, was undoubtedly in the court of the women, which was entered after having crossed that of the Gentiles. He often taught in this place (p. 96). The article τῶν and the present participle ἀναβαίνοντων indicate a permanent and well-known category of persons, the class of proselytes, not only among the Greeks (it is not necessary to supply Ἑλλήνων) but of every nation, who were ordinarily seen arriving at the time of the feasts. The προσήλθον, *they came to*, has in it something grave and solemn. The word of address: *Sir*, shows what respect they feel for the disciple of such a master. The imperfect ἤρωτων, *they asked*, expresses an action already begun which waits its completion from the answer of Philip. By the term ἰδεῖν, *to see*, these strangers present their desire in the most modest form. The appositional phrase: *from Bethsaida in Galilee*, serves undoubtedly to explain the reason why these Greeks addressed themselves to Philip. They were perhaps from a region in the neighborhood of Galilee, from Decapolis, for example, on the other side of the sea of Galilee, where there were cities which were entirely Greek. It is remarkable that Philip and Andrew, the two disciples who served as intermediaries for these proselytes, are the only ones among the apostles who have a name of Greek origin. The Greek name went, no doubt, hand in hand with Greek culture (*Hengstenberg*).

We discover here again the circumspect nature of Philip: he feels the gravity of the step which is asked of him. Jesus had always limited His activity to the Jewish people, according to the principle which He had laid down for Himself for the whole period of His earthly ministry (Matt. xv. 24): "*I was not sent except to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.*" He does venture alone to take the initiative in a request which would lead Jesus to turn aside from His ordinary course of action, and he takes the matter into consideration with Andrew, the one of the four disciples, who are placed first in rank in the apostolic catalogues, who is always put nearest to Philip. We have already seen him twice mentioned with Philip, in chaps. i. and iv.; and we are reminded here also that these two apostles, so particularly named by John, seem, according to the tradition, not to have been altogether strangers to the composition of our Gospel. The two together decide to present the request of the Greeks to Jesus.

Andrew, more active and decided than Philip, was probably the one who charged himself with making the request; for this reason it is that his name is placed first. Of the three readings, that of  $\aleph$  is evidently a mingling together of the two others. That of A B L is the most concise and most probable one (see *Meyer*). The question is one of no consequence.

This request produces upon Jesus a very profound impression. Why is this? In the first place, it awakens in Him the feeling of His relation to the heathen world, which until now has been in the background in His thoughts. He sees Himself destined to extend His work also over this immense domain. But this spiritual royalty, as He is well aware, can only be realized so far as He shall Himself have been freed from His Jewish environment and raised to a new form of existence; and this transformation implies His death. Thus the path to Calvary reveals itself to His view as the only one which can lead to the establishment of the new order of things. This is the reason why the request of these heathen agitates Him even to the depths of His soul (ver. 27). The heathen knock at the gate . . . all the bearing of the present hour both on His work and His person, both on the world and on Israel itself, is in this fact. It is a decisive hour, it is the great revolution of the universe which makes itself known. So, rather than reply by a yes or no to the request which is addressed to Him, He becomes absorbed in the reflections which are called forth within Him by this step. Did He receive these heathen? Did He refuse to have an interview with them? The story does not tell us. The following is the inference which *Reuss* draws from this fact: "The author limits himself to introducing them, then he leaves them there without giving any further attention to them. From this we may again judge of the degree of historical reality in these conversations which are contained in our Gospel." A number of jests directed against the commentators who "flounder in the difficulties of a blindly literal interpretation, and who cannot understand that such discourses are addressed not to the interlocutors, not even to the disciples, but only to the readers of the book." To this lofty mode of discussion we will oppose the words of *Renan*: "Here are verses which have an unquestionable historical stamp." And without going as far as *Westcott* does, who thinks that "the Greeks were immediately admitted, and that it was in their presence that Jesus pronounced the following words," we regard it as probable that in crossing the court of the Gentiles, on going out of the temple, Jesus would have given to these Greeks a testimony of sympathy which He never refused to any one of those who sought Him. John is silent respecting this point, as he is respecting the return of Nicodemus to his home, because the importance of these scenes is not, for him, in the facts of a material order. As *Luthardt* says, it is not the external, which concerns him in the history, but the moral substance of the facts. This substance is the impression produced on the soul of Jesus, and the discourse which reveals it.

Ver. 23. "*Jesus answered*<sup>1</sup> *them, The hour is come when the Son of man is*

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  B L X: ἀποκρίνεται, instead of ἀπεκρίνατο which is read by T. R. with 13 Mj. It. Syr.

to be glorified." The Alexandrian authorities read the present: *answers*. The T. R., with 13 Mjj. and the ancient Vss., reads the aorist middle ἀπεκρίνατο, *answered*. These two forms are very rare in our Gospel (two or three times, each of them). The aorist middle is more suitable than the aorist passive (the common form). It indicates a meditation to which Jesus gives himself, rather than a direct response.

The words: *The hour is come*, contain in the germ the whole following discourse, which is intended to reveal the importance of the present hour. And this, first, for Jesus Himself (vv. 29, 30); then, for the world (31-33); finally, for Israel in particular (34-36).

For Jesus it is the hour of His elevation and His personal transformation by the painful passage of death. That which has just happened has made Him feel the imminence of the crisis. The term δοξασθῆναι, *to be glorified*, applies here first of all, as in ver. 16 and vii. 39, to the heavenly exaltation of His person. His recognition as Messiah and the extension of His kingdom among the heathen (*Lücke, Reuss*) do not explain this term; these facts will be only the consequences of the change accomplished in His person (xvii. 1, 2, 5). The term *Son of man* is here suggested to Jesus by the feeling of His indissoluble connection with humanity, of which He will soon be the glorified representative. It is at that time that He will be able to do what is denied Him at this moment, to communicate without restraint with the Greeks and the whole world. In the 24th verse, Jesus expresses by means of a figure and in ver. 25 in plain terms, the *painful* condition which is imposed with reference to this glorification:

Ver. 24. "*Verily, verily, I say to you, Unless the grain of wheat dies after having fallen into the ground, it abides alone; but if it dies, it bears much fruit.*" Before He can answer to the need of salvation for the heathen world, the first symptom of which has just reached Him, something of serious moment must happen in Himself. So long as the grain of wheat remains in the granary, it is preserved, but without acquiring the power of reproducing itself; it is necessary that it should be cast into the earth, that its covering should be decomposed, that it should perish as a seed, in order that it may live again with a new existence, and may have a new birth in a multitude of beings like itself. We know the considerable part which is played by the grain of wheat in the Greek mysteries. The emphatic affirmation, *amen, amen*, refers to the contrast which Jesus knows to exist between this painful necessity of His death and His disciples' dreams of glory.

Ver. 25. Application of the figure: "*He who loves his life, loses<sup>1</sup> it; and he who hates his life in this world, shall preserve it unto life eternal.*" The relation between this sentence and the two preceding verses does not allow us to doubt that Jesus here applies it to Himself. To this fundamental law of human life, which He has so often declared with reference

<sup>1</sup> B L: ἀπολλυει (*loses it*) instead of ἀπολεσει (*shall lose it*), which is read by T. R. with the other Mjj.

to His disciples (Matt. x. 39, xvi. 25; Mark viii. 35; Luke ix. 24; xvii. 33), He here declares that He is Himself subjected, like themselves. By the expression, *his life*, *ψυχή*, Jesus designates the breath of the natural life, with all the faculties with which this life is endowed in the case of man. This physical and psychical life is good, as the *starting-point* of the human existence; Jesus also possesses it. But the destiny of the natural life is not to sustain and perpetuate itself as such; it must be transformed, by a superior force, into a spiritual, eternal life; but, in order to do this, it must be voluntarily surrendered, sacrificed, immolated in the form of self-renunciation. Otherwise, after having flourished for a time, and more or less satisfied itself, it decays and withers for ever. This law applies even to a pure being and to his lawful tastes. One may be called to sacrifice an honorable desire in order to respond to a higher duty; to refuse this call is to keep one's life, but in order to lose it. Everything which is not surrendered to God by a free act of sacrifice, contains a germ of death. Jesus, seeking his own safety, His personal life, might now, if He wished, escape from death, become the Socrates of the Greeks, the Cæsar of the Romans, the Solomon of the Jews; but this way of *preserving* His life would be to lose it. Not having surrendered it to God, He could not receive it from Him transformed and glorified (ver. 23); and, thus preserved, it would remain devoted to unfruitfulness and to earthly frailty. In order to become a Christ, He must renounce being a sage; He must not wish to ascend the throne of a Solomon, if He desires to take His place on that of God. *Lange* has profoundly remarked that this saying contains in particular the judgment of Hellenism. What was Greek civilization? The effort to realize an ideal of human life consisting in enjoyment and escaping the law of sacrifice. It is probable that the true reading is the present *loses* (*ἀπολλέει*) which was replaced by the future *shall lose* (*ἀπολέσει*), under the influence of the verb of the following clause. The idea of *losing* goes beyond that of *abiding alone* (ver. 14). The term *μισέειν*, *to hate*, expresses the feeling of a generous contempt, arising from the view of what one would lose by devoting himself to the keeping of this natural life. The expression: *unto life eternal*, placed in opposition, as it is here, to *in this world*, refers not only to the more elevated nature of this life (*Reuss*), but also to the future epoch in which it will break forth in its perfection. This saying, which means that man gives himself to find himself again, is that which Jesus has most frequently uttered (see above); it expresses the most profound law of human life. How should not this moral axiom, which governed the life of the Master, be applicable also to that of the disciples? It is evidently with a view to these latter also, that Jesus expresses it for a last time in this so solemn moment.

Ver. 26. "If any one serves me, let him follow me; and where I am, there shall also my servant be; if<sup>1</sup> any one serves me, him will my Father honor." To follow, here: on the pathway of sacrifice, which alone leads to the glorious metamorphosis. The Greek term: *where I am*, is a present of antici-

<sup>1</sup> B D L X It. Syr. reject *καί* (and) before *εάν* *τις*.

pation; it refers to the state of the celestial glory of Jesus, as the promise: *shall be there also*, refers to the participation of the faithful disciple in that state (xvii. 24). *Τιμήσει, shall honor*, recalls the *shall be glorified, δοξασθή*, of ver. 23. The Father will honor the faithful servant who has consented to bear the shame of His Son in renouncing all glory of his own; he will make him participate in the glorification of this Son. Herein is for both the *keeping* of the life which they have given up. Perhaps Andrew and Philip had seen with a somewhat carnal satisfaction the conduct of these strangers desirous to render homage to their Master. Jesus, accustomed to silence continually within Himself even the most lawful aspirations of the natural life, in view of His divine mission, suppresses by a word these ambitious thoughts on the part of His disciples. Then, immediately after having thus declared the law which obliges Him to die, He feels in His whole being the reaction of this formidable thought.

Vv. 27, 28a. "*Now is my soul troubled, and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour? But for this cause came I unto this hour.* 28a. *Father, glorify thy name.*" The soul, *ψυχή*, is the seat of the natural emotions, as the spirit, *πνεῦμα*, is that of the religious emotions. Weiss disputes this distinction by appealing to the altogether similar emotion described in xi. 33. But it is precisely this expression, especially when compared with xiii. 21, which confirms it. In these two passages the question is of a shuddering of a religious and moral nature at the evil which is approaching Him in the most hateful form. Here, on the contrary, it is the prospect of personal griefs and of death which so violently agitates Him. The term *ψυχή, soul*, is therefore perfectly in its place. I do not understand the import of the explanation of Weiss, which is intended to identify *ψυχή* and *πνεῦμα*: "The spirit becomes the soul in man" (see *Keil*). The perfect *τεταράκται, is troubled*, indicates a state in which the Lord feels Himself entirely overwhelmed. And this extraordinary trouble reveals itself especially to His consciousness by the hesitation which He feels, at the moment when He is seeking to pour out His emotion in prayer. Ordinarily, He has a distinct view of that which He should ask of His Father; now, this clearness fails Him. Like the believer in the state which St. Paul describes in Rom. viii. 26, He knows not how He should pray. He is obliged to lay before Himself for a moment the question: *What shall I say?* This question He does not address, properly speaking, to God, nor to man, but to Himself. The sacrifice of His own life is in itself a free act; He could still, if He saw fit, ask of God to release Him from it. And the Father would hear him, as always, even should it be necessary to send Him *twelve legions of angels*. But would not this prayer, while delivering Him, destroy mankind? Jesus does not feel Himself free to pray thus. He is already too far advanced on the path on which He is to realize the salvation of the world, to stop so near the end. The word *now*, which begins the sentence, characterizes this distress as an anticipation of that which awaits Him in the presence of the cross: *already now*, although the terrible hour has not yet struck. After the question: *What shall I say?* how are we to understand the words: *Father, save me from this hour?* Is this the

real prayer wherein this moment of uncertainty through which He has just passed, terminates? This is what is supposed by *Lücke, Meyer, Hengstenberg, Ebrard, Luthardt, Westcott*. What would be its meaning? "Release me from the necessity of dying," as when He offers the prayer in Gethsemane: "Let this cup pass from me"? This is held by the first three. But there he adds: *if it is possible*, and by the *πλὴν* which follows, He commits it immediately to the Father's will (Matt. xxvi. 39). And how can we explain the sudden change of impression in the following clause? After having uttered seriously and without restriction the petition: "Save me from this hour!" could He add, as it were in a single breath: "But for this hour am I come"? *Luthardt, Ebrard, and Westcott* perceive this clearly. So they propose to understand the *σῶσον με*, *save me*, not in the sense: "Deliver me from death," but in the sense: "Bring me victoriously out of this present inward struggle," either by shortening it or by giving it a happy issue. But how are we to explain the following adversative particle *ἀλλὰ*, *but*? Here *Westcott* proposes an absolute *tour de force*. "But to what purpose say this? The favorable issue is not doubtful." This sense of *but* is altogether forced; and there is no more opposition between: to come forth from the struggle, and: to have come for it. However we may turn this phrase, we are always brought back to see in it a hypothetical prayer. It is the voice of nature which at first makes itself heard in answer to the question: *What shall I say?* Then, in the following words Jesus represses this voice. To address this petition to God would be to deny all that He has done and endured until now. And finally, giving vent to the voice of the spirit, He definitely stays Himself in the prayer which alone remains, when once this moment of trouble is past: *Glorify thy name!* that is to say: "Derive from me Thy glory, by doing with me what Thou wilt. Nothing for me, everything for Thee!" What more instructive than this conflict between these two factors which solicit the will of Jesus? It allows us to penetrate into the inmost recess of His heart. What do we there discover? Precisely the opposite of that impassive Jesus whom our critics assert the Christ of John to be.

The expressions: *for this cause*, and: *for this hour*, seem to constitute a pleonasm. We might make this clause a question: "Is it then for this that I am come to this hour?" that is, to try to put it off indefinitely? Or we may make the words *for this hour* an explanatory apposition to *for this*: "It is for this that I am come, that is, for this hour." These two meanings are forced, the first, because of the two questions which already precede; the second, because the *εἰς* is not the natural resuming of the *διά*, but rather the direct objective word to *ἤλθον* and the antithesis of *σῶσον ἐκ*. *Hengstenberg* explains: "It is that my soul may be troubled that I am come . . .," which is still more forced. *Lücke* and *Meyer* make the words *for this* bear upon the idea of the following prayer (ver. 28): *Father, glorify thy name*. This is to do violence to the sentence beyond measure. Is it not quite simple to see in the neuter *this* the expression, in a slight degree mysterious, of that *something* which has just brought trouble upon His soul, and which He is tempted to seek to remove by

His prayer, the dark and unutterable contents of the hour which is approaching? "It is because of this death which I am to undergo, that I have persevered in this path until this hour." All that he has done and suffered in view of the cross does not permit Him to give way at the moment when the hour of this terrible punishment is about to strike. Comp. iii. 14.—The pronoun *thy* (ver. 28), by reason of the place which it occupies, is emphasized. It is opposed, as *Weiss* says, to the personal character of the preceding prayer which Jesus has set aside.

*Colani*, in his criticism of the *Vie de Jésus* by *Renan*, by a strange inadvertence makes Jesus say: "Father, glorify *my* name," an expression which, he says, "has no meaning except from the standpoint of the Logos-doctrine."<sup>1</sup> The more involuntary this alteration is, the better is it fitted to make us see the difference between the profoundly human Jesus of John and the fantastic Christ whom criticism ascribes to the evangelist. That, after this, *Colani* sees in this scene only "an emblematic, almost simulated, agony" is easy to understand; to whom does the fault belong? *Reuss*, who claims that the silence of John respecting the scene of Gethsemane arises from the fact that "even a passing weakness would have been a feature incompatible with the portrait of the Johannean Christ," finds himself greatly embarrassed by the narrative which occupies us. The following is the way in which he escapes from the difficulty. "The emotion of Jesus is not that of a momentary and touching weakness . . . , it is that of a great soul, of a divine heroism . . . whose resolution is rather strengthened than shaken in the presence of the supreme catastrophe." We leave the reader to judge whether this exegesis reproduces or contradicts the true tone of the text to be explained, particularly of these words: "Now is my soul troubled." What we admire in this passage, is the perfectly human character of the struggle which, at the thought of His approaching death, takes place in the heart of Jesus between nature and spirit. And then it is the sincerity, the candor, shall we say, with which He expresses His inmost feelings, *His weakness* (Heb. v. 2), before all this company of people, not hesitating to make them acquainted with the perplexity into which the prospect of His approaching sufferings plunges Him. This scene is, as has always been acknowledged, the prelude to the one in Gethsemane. Only in the latter, Jesus, at the highest point of His distress, really utters the cry: *Save me from this hour!* while at the moment which we have now reached, He only asks whether He shall pray thus. This delicate shade is suited to the difference of the two situations and proves the strictly historical character of each of them. The opinion that John suppressed the scene of Gethsemane as incompatible with the divine character of the Logos, falls of itself before this passage. Finally, let us establish the remarkable gradation in the three analogous scenes, Luke xii. 49, 50, John xii. 27 and the one in Gethsemane. This comparison makes us understand the increasing emotion with which Jesus was slowly approaching the cross. These three features borrowed from the four narratives easily unite in one single picture. How can *Réville* express himself as follows, in the *Revue de théologie*, 1865, III., p. 316, "The fourth Gospel makes Jesus an exalted being, as to His moral life, above temptation and internal conflict, and it removes from its narrative all the traditional statements which might suggest a contrary idea." *Renan*, on the contrary,

<sup>1</sup> *Revue de théologie*, 3d series, I., p. 382.

observes with reference to this passage: "Here are verses which have an indubitable historical stamp. They are the obscure and isolated episode of the Greeks who address themselves to Philip."

Vv. 28b, 29. "*Whereupon there came a voice from heaven, I have both glorified it and I will glorify it again.* 29. *The multitude therefore that stood by and heard it, said that it thundered; others said, An angel has spoken to him.*" Each time that the Son performs a great act of self-humiliation and personal consecration, the Father answers by a sensible manifestation of approval. What had happened at the baptism and the transfiguration is now renewed. At this hour which is the closing of Jesus' ministry, and in which He devoted Himself to death, is the time—or never—for the Father publicly to set the seal of His satisfaction upon His person and His work.

*Lücke, de Wette, Hengstenberg, Weiss*, regard this voice from heaven as a simple thunder-clap. By reason of the coincidence of this external phenomenon with His prayer, Jesus, in their view, interpreted it freely in the sense indicated by the evangelist. Is not thunder often called in the Old Testament, *the voice of the Lord*? The Rabbis gave a name to these prophetic voices, these mysterious inspirations which a word accidentally heard calls up in the hearts of believers, namely, *Bath-Kol* (*daughter of the voice*). But the text does not favor this interpretation of the phenomenon here related. According to John, it is not a clap of thunder taken to be a voice from heaven; it is, on the contrary, a voice from heaven which a part of the multitude regard as a clap of thunder; comp. *Meyer*. How could Jesus say: *this voice* (ver. 30)? How could this voice be translated by Him or by John into a definite expression in words? Whence would arise in these words the contrast between the past (*I have glorified*) and the future (*I will glorify*), a contrast which has no connection with anything in the prayer of Jesus? How, finally, could one part of the multitude itself discern in this sound an articulate language which they attribute to an angel? The text permits us to think only of a divine phenomenon. As to the Rabbinical superstition called *Bath-Kol*, it cannot be cited here, since one would infer from such signs only a human voice. The past *I have glorified* refers to the ministry of the Lord in Israel, which is close upon its end; the future *I will glorify*, to the approaching action of Jesus on the whole world, when from the midst of His glory He will enlighten the heathen. Between these two great works which the Father accomplishes through the Son, is placed precisely the hour of suffering and death which is the necessary transition from the one to the other. There is no ground therefore to draw back before this hour. It is, moreover, well surrounded. Before,—the name of God glorified in Israel; after,—the name of God glorified in the whole world. Here indeed is the most consoling response for the filial heart of Jesus (xvii. 1, 2, 4, 5). The two *kat, und, and*, bring out the close connection between the work done and the work to be done: "I who have accomplished the one, will also accomplish the other."

The whole multitude hear a sound; but the meaning of the voice is

perceived by each one only in proportion to his spiritual intelligence. Thus, in human speech the wild beast perceives only a *sound*, the trained animal discovers in it a *meaning*, a command, for example, which it immediately obeys; man only discerns in it a *thought*. Ὁχλος: the greater number; ἄλλοι: others in smaller numbers; comp. Acts ix. 7 with xxii. 9; xxvi. 13, 14, where an analogous phenomenon occurs at the time of the appearance of Jesus to Paul. In order to understand a vision, there must be an internal organ and this organ may be more or less favorably disposed. At Pentecost, where some see only the effects of drunkenness, others discern a revelation of the glorious things of God (Acts ii. 11-13). The perfect λελάληκεν, instead of the aorist, signifies that to their view Jesus is for the future a person *in possession* of this heavenly sign.

Vv. 30-32. "*Jesus answered and said: Not for my sake has this voice<sup>1</sup> made itself heard, but for your sakes. 31. Now is the judgment of this world;<sup>2</sup> now shall the prince of this world be cast out. 32. And I, when I shall have been lifted up from the earth, will draw all<sup>3</sup> men unto me.*" In declaring that this voice does not make itself heard for His sake, Jesus does not mean to say that He has no need to be strengthened; but only that He had not needed to be strengthened in this way, that is, by a sensible manifestation. What the procedure of the Greeks has been for Him, in awakening vividly within Him the feeling of the gravity of the present hour, this heavenly phenomenon should be for them, by revealing to them the decisive importance of the crisis which is accomplished in this moment. And first, as to the world, this hour is that of the most radical revolution (vv. 31, 32). It is that of its judgment (ver. 31a), of the expulsion of its former master (ver. 31b), and of the advent of its new monarch (ver. 32). The word *vñv, now*, at the beginning of the first two clauses, sets forth expressly this decisive character of the present moment for humanity.

To judge is to declare the moral state, not only as evil but also as good. I cannot accept, therefore, the meaning which Weiss gives here to the word κρίσις, *judgment*, in applying it only to the condemnation of the world as the consequence of the rejection and the death of Christ. No doubt, the cross is the basis of the condemnation of the world, as it reveals completely the moral state of natural humanity. This throne, erected for Jesus by man, shows the depth of hostility to God which is in his heart. But this is not the only side of the judgment of the world by the work of Christ; comp. iii. 21 following iii. 18-20. Passing before the cross, one part of mankind find in it their salvation through faith, while the other part through unbelief complete their condemnation. Here is the judgment of the world which is the consequence of Holy Friday. It will begin inwardly on this very day. Its first great outward manifestation will be Pentecost; the second will be the fall of Jerusalem. The final universal judgment will be the solemn ratification of it (ver. 48).

<sup>1</sup> T. R. with 11 Mjj. (E F G); *αυτη η φωνη*, instead of *η φωνη αυτη*, in 7 Mjj (N A B etc.).

<sup>2</sup> N omits the words *νυν ο αρχων τ. κ. τουτου* substituting for them *και* (a confusion of the

*two του κοσμου τουτου*).

<sup>3</sup> Instead of *παντας*, N D It. Vulg. read *παντα* (*every man or all things*).

But, at the same time that the cross will manifest the moral state of the world, it will exhaust the measure of toleration accorded to its prince. The crucifixion of the Son of God is the most odious, the most unpardonable crime of Satan: this crime puts an end to the long-suffering of God towards him, and, consequently, to his dominion over mankind. The Rabbis habitually designate Satan as the *prince of the world* (*Sar ha'holam*). But they place the Jews outside of his empire, which includes only the Gentiles. Jesus, on the contrary, counts this rebellious people as belonging to it (chap. viii.), which He even especially calls *the world* (xv. 18). *Out* signifies not only; out of his office and power, but above all: out of his former domain, the world, mankind in the natural state. This meaning appears from the relation of these words to those which precede. "With the consummation of the redemptive work," says *Weiss*, "the expulsion of the devil begins." One soul after another is taken away from him, and the progress goes on advancing even to the final day. Thus this saying does not contradict those which still ascribe to Satan an activity in the world.

To the deposition of the former ruler answers the advent of the new sovereign. Jesus expressly designates Himself as the one who is called to fill this office: *κἀγώ, and I*. But, a strange fact, as He substitutes Himself for Satan, it is not on the earth, from which Satan is driven out, that He establishes His kingdom. The Jews imagined that the Messiah would become *here on earth* the successor of His adversary, that He would be another prince *of this world*. But no, He will leave the world, as does also His rival; He will be obliged to leave it that He may be elevated above it, and it is from this higher sphere that He will draw His subjects to Him, and will realize His kingdom. However little familiar we may be with the language of Jesus, we may understand that the expression, *be lifted up* must be taken here in the same amphibological sense as in iii. 14 and viii. 28. His suspension on the cross is identified with the elevation to the throne to which it is for Him the way. *Meyer* objects against this double sense of the word *be lifted up* the limiting phrase *ἐκ τῆς γῆς, out of the earth*, which proves, according to him, that Jesus is thinking not of His death, but of the ascension. It is no doubt very evident that the expression *out of the earth* does not refer only to the small distance of two or three cubits between the ground and the feet of the crucified one. But it is this very expression: *out of the earth*, which forces us to see in the word *be lifted up*, an allusion to the punishment of the cross. If Jesus had thought only of the ascension, the natural limiting phrase would have been *into heaven or to the Father*. By saying *from the earth*, He indicates the violent manner in which He will be expelled from this domain over which He is to reign. There will be made for a time an abyss between the earth and Himself. This will render necessary for a time the heavenly and invisible form of His kingdom. Now it is to the cross that this temporary separation between the earth and Him will be due; comp. Gal. vi. 14.

The cross and the ascension taken together therefore freed Jesus from all earthly bonds and especially from all His national obligations towards Israel. They thus put Him in a position to extend His activity over the

whole world, to become *the Lord of all* (Rom. x. 12). This is what enables Him to say "*I will draw them all unto me*;" all, not only the Jews, but all men, and consequently the Greeks. From this word *all* and from this future *I will draw*, His response to the request which had called forth this discourse clearly appears. The hour of the call of the Greeks draws near; but, before it strikes, another hour is to strike! Some limit the *all* to the elect; others give it this sense: men of every nation; Meyer seems to find in it the idea of final universal salvation. But *ἐλκείν*, *to draw*, does not necessarily denote an effectual drawing. This word may refer only to the preaching of the cross throughout the whole world and the action of the Holy Spirit which accompanies it. This heavenly drawing is not irresistible. The last word: *to me*, literally, *to myself*, makes prominent the personal position of Jesus as the supra-terrestrial centre of the kingdom of God. Once exalted to heaven, He becomes at the same time the author and the end of the divine drawing, and gathers around Himself His new people, heavenly like Himself.

These two verses sum up the whole history of the Church; both from a negative and polemical point of view: the gradual destruction of the kingdom of Satan, and from a positive point of view: the progressive establishment of the kingdom of God.

Ver. 33. "*Now this he said, signifying by what death he should die.*" This explanation of John is declared to be false by some modern interpreters (Meyer, Reuss, etc.), Jesus having spoken, according to them, of the Ascension, not of the cross. But we have seen that the idea of the cross was necessarily implied in the preceding words, and it must, indeed, be remarked that the apostle does not say *δηλών*, *declaring*, plainly, but only *σημαίνων*, *indicating, giving to understand*. John means simply to say that in giving this form to His thought, Jesus gives an anticipatory hint of the kind of death which He must undergo. Reuss would indeed draw from this false explanation of the Evangelist a proof in favor of the authenticity of the words of ver. 32. We think we have better reasons for holding the authenticity. This striking passage in which Jesus, after having shuddered in view of the cross, strengthened Himself by tracing in broad outlines the picture of the immense revolution which it will effect, may be compared with that of St. Paul, Col. ii. 14, 15, where that apostle represents Jesus as making a spectacle of the infernal powers, despoiling them of their power and triumphing over them on the cross. Comp. also the passage, 2 Cor. v. 14—17, according to which the death of Christ is virtually a principle of death for the whole human race, but thereby the means of universal renewal. According to the Jewish programme, the Messianic kingdom was to be the glorification of the earth, and the Messiah the visible sovereign of this new Eden; how could the Messianic character of Jesus, therefore, accord with the idea of leaving the earth? Hence the following question of the Jews, ver. 34.

Ver. 34. "*The multitude answered<sup>1</sup> him, We have heard from the law that the*

<sup>1</sup> B L X add οὐν to ἀπεκριθη.

*Christ abides for ever ; how sayest thou then, The Son of man must be lifted up? Who is this Son of man?*" Ver. 34. "How sayest thou, thou?" This *thou* is opposed to *we, ἡμεῖς*: we who are acquainted with the law and those among us who explain it. The passages to which the Jews allude are those in which the Messiah is represented as founding on the ruins of the heathen empires an eternal kingdom: Is. ix. 6; Ps. cx. 2-4; Dan. vii. 14, etc. On the term *the law*, see p. 165. In order to resolve the difficulty, the objectors themselves make a supposition respecting which they ask to be enlightened. Jesus has the habit of designating Himself as the Son of man; might this name perhaps designate in His mouth a personage different from the Christ? This question is not without analogy to that which John the Baptist addressed to Jesus from the centre of his prison: "Art thou he that should come or are we to look for another?" (Vol. I., p. 323 f.). The Jews certainly do not mean: Is this Son of man thyself or some other? He has just applied to Himself this title, ver. 23. As Jesus has always refused to take openly before them the title of Christ, they ask themselves rather if the term Son of man does not designate a different personage from the Messiah, one of the numerous forerunners who were looked for. *Meyer* and *Weiss* explain differently: "What a strange Messiah is he who wishes to go away, instead of transforming everything!" But the terms of the question do not express this idea. The expression must have been: What sort of Christ is this! and not: *Who is this Son of man?* These words of the people appear to me to prove that the title *Son of man* was not generally used in Israel to designate the Messiah; and, as we have already seen, it was precisely for this reason that Jesus had chosen it to designate Himself habitually (vol. I., p. 338 f.). We find ourselves in accord on this point with Colani.<sup>1</sup> The question proposed by His hearers leads Jesus to explain to them the vital importance of the present hour for Israel in particular.

Vv. 35, 36. "*Jesus therefore said to them, The light is with you*<sup>2</sup> *only a little while longer ; walk while*<sup>3</sup> *you have the light, lest the darkness overtake you ; and he that walks in the darkness knows not whither he goes. 36. While*<sup>4</sup> *you have the light, believe on the light, that you may become children of light. Jesus said this to them ; then, departing, he hid himself from them.*" Jesus does not reply to them directly. It was no longer the time to teach and discuss. He addresses to their hearts a last warning, a final appeal, by making them feel the decisive importance of the present hour for themselves and for their whole people. This is the reason why John says *εἶπεν he said, declared, not ἀπεκρίθη, he answered*. The day of salvation is at its end; the sun which still enlightens Israel is going to disappear in a few moments. When the sun sets, those who have a journey to make must hasten before

<sup>1</sup> *Jésus-Christ et les croyances messianiques de son temps*, p. 75 ff. But how can this author say: In order to find in the mouth of Jesus this title of Son of man, we must go back "at least four months earlier (viii. 28)." He forgets ver. 23 which immediately precedes.

<sup>2</sup> T. R. with A E F G H S U Δ Δ Mnn. Syr: μεθ' υμῶν (*with you*); ⳑ B D K M X II 20 Mnn. It. Vulg. Cop.: εν υμιν (*among you*).

<sup>3</sup> A B D K L X II 4 Mnn.: ως (*as*), instead of εως (*so long as*) which T. R. reads with II Mjj.

<sup>4</sup> ⳑ A B D L II: ως instead of εως.

the night comes on. By this journey, Jesus means the act of believing, for all those who are still far removed from Him. When once the heavenly revealer shall be no longer present, the unbelieving people will be like a traveler lost in the night, who wanders at a venture without seeing either pathway or end. If vv. 31, 32 sum up the whole history of the Church, it may be well said that ver. 35 contains that of Israel from the day on which Jesus was speaking to the present hour. The apostolic preaching was no doubt still granted to this people, but how, when once launched on the declivity of unbelief, could Israel, *as a people*, have changed its course. And when the preaching of the apostles, that last gift of grace, had rescued a certain number of individuals from the ruin, it was soon withdrawn from the nation. Since then, Israel wanders in the wilderness of this world, as a caravan without a goal and without a guide. The two readings: *with you* and *among you* differ only in the figure. It is not altogether so with the readings *ἕως*, *while* (T. R.) and *ὡς*, *as* or *according as*. Meyer, Weiss, Luthardt, Keil, adopting the second, give to *ὡς* its ordinary logical sense: *as, conformably to the fact that*: "Walk according as you have the light," that is to say: "Because of the fact that you still have the light, come to it, believe!" It is with reason, as it seems to me, that *Bäumlein* declares this explanation of *ὡς* impossible. The words: *yet a little time*, force us to give it the temporal sense. We must, therefore, either understand it in the sense of *when* which the French *comme* so often has (comp. for this use of *ὡς* in the New Testament, Luke xii. 58: "*As* thou goest," for: "*While* thou goest)," or read *ἕως*, *while*, notwithstanding the Alexandrian authorities. The initial *ε* of this word was undoubtedly confounded with the final *ε* of the preceding word *περιπατεῖτε*. I should not be surprised, however, if it were otherwise in ver. 36, and if the true reading here were *ὡς*. The idea of *because of the fact that* is much more admissible in this sentence, "*Because of the fact that you have the light, believe in the light;*" comp. Gal. vi. 10, where the *ὡς* may be explained in the same way. This is precisely the reading of the *Sinaitic MS*. It is the more easily explained, in this case, how in ver. 35 the *ὡς* may have been substituted for *ἕως*. In two sentences so near together and so similar, the copyists may have made either the first conform to the second, or the reverse. An equal solemnity reigns in these two appeals of vv. 35 and 36; only in the former the tone of pity prevails; in the latter, that of tenderness. The last word of the Saviour to His people was to be an invitation, not a menace: "Since you still possess in me the living revelation of God (*φῶς*, *the light*), acknowledge it, believe on it, to the end that you *may become* (*γένησθε*) *children of light*." Through faith in Christ man is so penetrated by light that he himself becomes luminous.

Such was the farewell of Jesus to Israel. The words: *He said these things*, signify that He gave them no other response. Thereupon He withdraws; and on the following day He does not reappear. The people waited for Him in the temple as usual (Luke xxi. 38); but in vain. It was at this time no longer a mere cloud which veiled the sun; the sun had set, the night was come.

## THIRD SECTION.

## XII. 37-50.

## RETROSPECTIVE GLANCE AT THE MYSTERIOUS FACT OF JEWISH UNBELIEF.

This passage forms the close of the second part of the Gospel (v. 1-xii. 36). The evangelist interrupts his narrative that he may give himself up to a meditation on the fact which he has just set forth. What is this fact? Is it, as some interpreters suppose (*Reuss, Westcott*, for example) the public ministry of Jesus? The entire part—chaps. v.-xii.—is the representation of the public activity of the Lord, while chaps. xiii.-xvii. describe His *private activity*. This view appears to us very superficial. Between these two parts, there exists a much more profound contrast than that of a more or less limited circle of activity; it is that of unbelief and faith, of unbelief in the people and of faith in the disciples. Is it not obvious that the real subject of the following epilogue, that which preoccupies the mind of John and becomes for a moment the subject of his meditation, is not the public ministry of Jesus, but the unbelief of the Jewish people. The question to which John replies is this: How explain the failure of the work of the Messiah in Israel? It is indeed one of the most obscure problems of history. It rose in all its greatness, after the preceding part of the Gospel, before the eyes of the historian and his readers. In the first passage, vv. 37-43, Jesus explains the *causes* of this mysterious fact; in the second, vv. 44-50, he shows the *gravity* of it by summing up its tragical *consequences*.

I.—*The causes of Jewish unbelief*: vv. 37-43.

If the Jews are the chosen people, prepared of God to the end of receiving the Messiah and of carrying salvation to other nations, ought they not to have been the first to open their arms to Jesus? Or, if they did not, must it not be inferred from this fact that Jesus was not really the Messiah? Chaps. ix.-xi. of the Epistle to the Romans are designed to examine into this great paradox of the religious history of mankind; it was the great apologetic question of the time of the apostles. Thus it is that the following passage in John contains many of the thoughts which likewise form the basis of St. Paul's dissertation.

Vv. 37, 38. "*Now, although he had done so many miracles in their presence, they did not believe on him, 38 that the word which Isaiah the prophet had spoken might be fulfilled: Lord, who has believed our preaching and to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed?*" However irrational is the fact with which John is about to occupy himself, it must be accomplished, for it was foreseen and *foretold*. How many motives to believe were there for the Jews in the appearance of Jesus, particularly in His miracles which were the testimony of God, the seal with which He marked His Son, *signs* the meaning of which it was easy to apprehend, especially for Jews (1 Cor. i. 22)! The word *ποσάυτα*, *so many*, in our gospels, refers always to number, not to

greatness; comp. vi. 9, xxi. 11; it is also sometimes its meaning in the classics; comp. the expression *τοσαῦτα τε καὶ τοιαῦτα*. These words imply that Jesus had done a much larger number of miracles than the six related in this book; comp. vii. 3, xx. 30. John did not wish therefore to relate everything that he knew. The term *σημεῖα*, *signs*, calls to mind the divine purpose in these works, and the words *ἐμπροσθεν αὐτῶν*, *in their presence*, their complete publicity. The imperfect, *they did not believe*, sets forth the continuance, the obstinate persistency of the Israelitish unbelief, notwithstanding the signs which were renewed every day before their eyes.

Scarcely any one seeks any longer to weaken the sense of *ἵνα*, *in order that*, by making it a *ὥστε*, *so that*. The passage quoted is Is. liii. 1. The prophet, at the moment of describing the humiliation, the death and the exaltation of the Messiah, asks himself whether there will be any one in Israel who is disposed to welcome with faith a *message* such as this, so contrary to the carnal aspirations of the people. Now the Messiah to whom the prophecy refers cannot hope for a better welcome than the message itself. These two things, the message and the Messiah who is its subject, are so completely one and the same thing to the view of the prophet that in the second clause, parallel to the first, there is no more any question except of the Messiah (*the arm of the Lord recognized*). The reply to the question *Who has believed?* is, in the thought of the prophet, either no one, or a small number of persons; they can be counted. According to some, the expression *ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν*, *our hearing*, signifies: *that which we hear from the mouth of Jehovah*, either we prophets (*Hengstenberg*), or we Jews who have attained to faith, the prophet being included (*Hofmann, Delitzsch, Keil*). But it is much more natural to explain: "*That which we cause to be heard (we prophets).*" It is certainly not the people hearing; it is the prophets preaching who can raise such a question. The first expression: *that which we preach*, refers to the suffering Messiah described in the following picture; the second: *the arm of the Lord*, to the acts of divine power of which He will be the agent, especially at His resurrection and at His exaltation, which are the crowning points of this picture (Is. liii. 10-12). The prophecy had thus declared that a Messiah, such as God should send, would not find faith in Israel; His humiliation would to such a degree shock this people, who would not even have eyes to discern the manifestations of the divine power in His appearance. But the fact might be *foretold* without being *desired* by God. Well, it was at once desired and announced, so far that God Himself coöperated in its execution. Such is the advance from ver. 38 to ver. 39. Yes, in this blindness there is something supernatural!

Vv. 39, 40. "*And indeed they could not believe, because Isaiah said again, 40 He has blinded their eyes and hardened<sup>1</sup> their hearts, that they should not see with their eyes and understand<sup>2</sup> with their heart, and be converted,*<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Byz. (Γ Δ etc.) read *πεπρωκεν*; the Alex. (Α Β Κ Λ Χ): *επωρωσεν*; Ξ Π *επηρωσεν*.

<sup>2</sup> Instead of *νοησασιν*, Κ Η Chrys. *συνωσιν*.

<sup>3</sup> Ξ Β Δ: *στραφωσιν*, instead of *πιστραφωσιν*. (T. R. with 10 Mjj.); 5 Mjj. (Κ Λ etc.): *επιστρεψωσιν*.

and I should heal<sup>1</sup> them." The omnipotence of God itself worked to the end of realizing that which His omniscience had foretold, and to make Israel do the impossible thing. Not only they *did not believe* (ver. 37); but they *could not believe* (ver. 39). The word *πάλιν* (*again*) reminds us that there is here a *second* idea, serving to explain the fact by completing the first. This logical relation answers to the meaning of the two expressions of Isaiah quoted by John. The *διὰ τοῦτο*, *for this cause*, refers, as ordinarily in John (v. 18, x. 17, etc.), to the following *ὅτι*, *because*: "And *this is the reason why* they could not believe: *it is because* Isaiah in another passage (*πάλιν*) said." It is in vain that *Weiss* tries to make the *διὰ τοῦτο*, *for this cause*, also refer to the preceding idea, namely, that of the fact; it refers to the following *ὅτι* and consequently to the *cause* of the fact (see *Keil*). These words are taken from Is. vi. 9, 10. The word of address, *Lord*, added by the LXX., passed thence to John. The quotation differs both from the Hebrew text and from that of the LXX., in that according to the former, it is Isaiah who is said to blind and harden the people by his ministry: "*Make the heart of this people fat*;" according to the latter, this hardening is a simple fact laid to the charge of Israel: "*The heart of this people is hardened*;" in John, on the contrary, the understood subject of the two verbs (*he has blinded, he has hardened*) can only be God. This third form is evidently a deliberate correction of the latter, in order to go back to the meaning of the former. For this fact accomplished by Isaiah, being the execution of the command of God, is rightly attributed by John to God Himself. This passage proves that the evangelist, while attaching himself to the Greek translation, was not dependent on it and was acquainted with the Hebrew text (vol. I., p. 197 f.). *τυφλοῦν*, *to make blind*, designates the depriving of intellectual light, of the sense of the true and even of the useful, of simple good sense; *πωροῦν*, *to harden the skin*, the depriving of moral sensibility, the sense of the good. From the paralysis of these two organs unbelief must necessarily result; the people may see miracle after miracle, may hear testimony after testimony, yet they will not discern in the one whom God thus points out, and who gives all these testimonies to Himself, their Messiah. The subject of the two verbs is undoubtedly God (*Meyer, Reuss*), but God in the person of that Adonai who (according to Is. vi. 1) gives the command to the prophet. The reading of nearly all the Mjj. is *ἰάσομαι*, *and I shall heal them*. This future might signify: "And I shall end by bringing them to myself through the means of their very hardening." The two *καί* *and* . . . *and*, however, are too closely related to each other for such a contrast between the last verb and those which precede it to be admissible. The force of the formidable *ἵνα μή*, *in order that I* . . . , evidently extends as far as the end of the sentence. The construction of the indicative with this conjunction has nothing unusual in it (1 Cor. xiii. 3; 1 Pet. iii. 1; Apoc. xxii. 14); it is frequent also in the classic Greek with *ὅπως*. We might undoubtedly explain in this way: "lest they should be converted, in which case I will

<sup>1</sup> All the Mjj., except L Γ, read *ἰασομαι*, instead of *ἰασωμαι*.

heal them" (for: I would heal them). But the other sense remains the more natural one: God does not desire to heal them; it is not in accordance with His actual intentions towards them. This is precisely the reason why He does not desire that they should believe—a thing which would force Him to pardon and heal them.

If such is the meaning of the words of the prophet and of those of the evangelist, how can it be justified? These declarations would be inexplicable and revolting if, at the moment when God addresses them to Israel and treats Israel in this way, this people were in the normal state, and God regarded them still as *His* people. But it was by no means so; when sending Isaiah, God said to him: "*Go and tell THIS people*" (Is. vi. 9). And we know what a father means, when speaking of his son, he says: *this* child, instead of *my* child: the paternal and filial relation is momentarily broken. An abnormal state has begun, which obliges God to use means of an extraordinary character. This divine dispensation towards Israel enters therefore into the category of *chastisements*. The creature who has long abused the divine favors falls under the most terrible of punishments; from an *end* it becomes for the time a *means*. In fact man can, by virtue of his liberty, refuse to glorify God by his obedience and salvation; but even in this case he cannot prevent God from glorifying Himself in him by a chastisement capable of making the odious character of his sin shine forth conspicuously. "God," says *Hengstenberg*, "has so constituted man, that, when he does not resist the first beginnings of sin, he loses the right of disposing of himself and forcibly obeys even to the end the power to which he has surrendered himself." God does not merely *permit* this development of evil; He *wills* it and *concurs* in it. But how, it will be said, will the holiness of God, as thus understood, be reconciled with His love? This is that which St. Paul explains to the Jews by the example of their ancient oppressor, Pharaoh, Rom. ix. 17: In the first place, this king refuses to hearken to God and to be saved; he has the prerogative to do so. But after this he is passively used for the salvation of others. God paralyses in him both the sense of the true and the sense of the good; he becomes deaf to the appeals of conscience and even to the calculations of self-interest properly understood; he is given up to the inspirations of his own foolish pride, in order that, through the conspicuous example of the ruin into which he precipitates himself, the world may learn what it costs wickedly to resist the first appeals of God. Thereby he at least serves the salvation of the world. The history of Pharaoh is reproduced in that of the Jews in the time of Jesus Christ. Already at the epoch of Isaiah the mass of the people were so carnal that their future unbelief in the Messiah, the man of sorrows, appears to the prophet an inevitable moral fact (Is. liii.). We must even go further and say, with Paul and John, that, things being thus, this unbelief must have been *willed* of God. What would have become of the kingdom of God, indeed, if an Israel like this had outwardly and without a change of heart received Jesus as its Messiah and had become with such dispositions the nucleus of the Church? This purely intellectual adherence of Israel, instead of advancing the divine work in the heathen world, would have served only to hinder it. We have the proof of this in the injurious part which was played in the Apostolic Church by the Pharisaic minority who accepted the faith. Suppose that the Jewish people *en masse* had acted thus and had governed the Church, the work of St. Paul would not have been possible; the Jewish monopoly would have

taken possession of the gospel; there would have been an end of the universalism which is the essential characteristic of the new covenant. The rejection of the Jews thus disposed was therefore a measure necessary to the salvation of the world. It is in this sense that St. Paul says in Rom. xi. 12: "that the fall of Israel has become the riches of the world," and ver. 15: "that its rejection has been the reconciliation of the world." How, indeed, could the Gentiles have welcomed a salvation connected with circumcision and the Mosaic observances? God was therefore obliged to make Israel blind, that the miracles of Jesus might be as nothing in their eyes and as not having taken place, and to harden them, that His preachings might remain for them as empty sounds (Is. vi.). Thus Israel proud, legal, carnal, rejected and could be rejected *freely*. This decided position did not in reality make Israel's lot worse; but it had for the salvation of the Gentiles the excellent results which St. Paul develops in Rom. xi. Far more than this, by this very chastisement, Israel became what it had refused to be by its salvation, the apostle of the world; and, like Judas its type, it fulfilled, willingly or unwillingly, its irrevocable commission; comp. Rom. xi. 7-10. Moreover, it is clear that, in the midst of this national judgment, every *individual* remained free to turn to God by repentance and to escape the general hardening. Ver. 13 of Isaiah and ver. 42 of John are the proof of this.

As to the relation of the Jewish unbelief to the divine *provision* (vv. 37, 38), John does not indicate the metaphysical theory by means of which he succeeds in reconciling the foreknowledge of God with the responsibility of man; he simply accepts these two data, the one of the religious sentiment, the other of the moral consciousness. But if we reflect that God is above time, that, properly speaking, He does not *foresee* an event which is for us yet to come, but that He *sees* it, absolutely as we behold a present event; that, consequently, when He declares it at any moment whatsoever, He does not *foretell* it, but *describes* it as a spectator and witness, the apparent contradiction between these two seemingly contradictory elements vanishes. Once foretold, the event undoubtedly cannot fail to happen, because the eye of God cannot have presented to Him as *existing* that which will not be. But the event does not exist because God has seen it; God, on the contrary, has seen it because it *will be*, or rather because to His view it already *is*. Thus the real cause of Jewish unbelief, foretold by God, is not the divine foreseeing. This cause is, in the last analysis, the moral state of the people themselves. This state it is which, when once established by the earlier unfaithfulnesses of Israel, necessarily implies the punishment of unbelief which must strike the people at the decisive moment, the judgment of hardening.

Ver. 41. "*This did Isaiah say, when<sup>1</sup> he saw his glory and spoke of him.*" John justifies in this verse the application which he has just made to Jesus Christ of the vision of Is. vi. The Adonai whom Isaiah beheld at that moment was the divine being who is incarnated in Jesus. Herein also John and Paul meet together; comp. 1 Cor. x. 4, where Paul calls the one who guided Israel from the midst of the cloud *Christ*. Some interpreters have tried to refer the pronoun *αὐτοῦ*, *of him*, not to Christ, but to God. But the last words: *and spoke of him*, would be useless in this sense and

<sup>1</sup> N A B L M X some Mnn. Cop. Sah. read read by 12 Mjj. (D Γ Δ, etc.), the Mnn. It. *ὅτε* (because) instead of *ὅτε* (when) which is Syr. Chrys.

this remark would be aimless in the context. The Alexandrian reading, "because he saw," instead of "when he saw," is adopted by *Tischendorf*, *Weiss*, *Keil*, etc. But it does not appear to me acceptable. Its only reasonable sense would be: "because he really saw his glory and spoke of Him so long beforehand (a thing which seems impossible)." But this reflection would be very coldly apologetic and quite useless for readers who were accustomed to hear the prophecies quoted. It is much more easy to understand how the conjunction  $\delta\tau\epsilon$ , which is quite rarely used, may have been replaced by  $\delta\tau\iota$ , which appears in every line, than how the reverse could have taken place. The ancient Latin and Syriac versions are agreed in supporting the received text. The sense of the latter is simple and perfectly suitable. "It was of Christ, who manifested Himself to him as Adonai, that Isaiah spoke *when* he uttered such words." John proves that he has the right to apply this passage here.

It might be inferred from vv. 37-41 that no Jew had either believed or been able to believe; vv. 42, 43, while completing this historical *résumé*, remove this misapprehension, but, at the same time, explain the want of significance of these few exceptions with reference to the general course of the history.

Vv. 42, 43. "It is true, nevertheless, that, even among the rulers, many believed on him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess their faith, lest they should be put out of the synagogue; 43 for they loved the glory which comes from men more than<sup>1</sup> the glory which comes from God." This exception confirms the rule, since it proves that, even where faith had been awakened, the fear of men suppressed the profession and development of it. We see from this remarkable expression how heavy was the yoke which Pharisaism made to rest as a burden upon Israel (see the parables of chap. x.). The moral cause of the hardening and blinding of the people (ver. 40) was precisely this power of Pharisaic fanaticism, which was incompatible with the spirit of the Gospel. Respecting  $\delta\mu\omega\varsigma$ , nevertheless, comp. Gal. iii. 15; 1 Cor. xiv. 7. The words: *lest they should be put out of the synagogue*, confirm what was said in ix. 22. The word  $\delta\delta\acute{\omicron}\zeta\alpha$ , in ver. 43, is taken nearly in its etymological sense: *opinion*, whence: *approbation*. The difference of reading ( $\delta\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho$  and  $\eta\pi\epsilon\rho$ ) is probably due to *itacism* (the pronouncing of  $\eta$  and  $\nu$  as  $\iota$ ). If  $\delta\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho$  is read, there are two forms of comparison combined here, as if for the purpose of better setting forth the odiousness of such a preference. Those who are commonly ranked in the class of these cowardly persons, are men like Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea. I cannot adopt this application (xix. 38-42). Those rather are in question who remained outwardly attached to the Jewish system, such as Gamaliel and many others, the *Erasmuses* of that time. On the necessity of profession for salvation, comp. Rom. x. 10.

## II.—*The consequences of faith and unbelief*: vv. 44-50.

Israel was not only blinded with reference to the signs; it was deaf as regarded the testimonies which accompanied them, and this is what

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  L X 5 Mm. read  $\nu\pi\epsilon\rho$  instead of  $\eta\pi\epsilon\rho$ .

finally renders its unbelief unpardonable. Such is the meaning and spirit of this passage; it is not a summary of the teaching of Jesus in general. It is a *résumé* made from the special standpoint of Jewish unbelief. The first part sets forth the privilege connected with faith (vv. 44-46); the second, the condemnation which will strike unbelief (vv. 47, 48); the third, the reason of the gravity of these two moral facts which was so decisive (vv. 49, 50). Criticism rightly disputes the view that Jesus ever delivered the following discourse; it alleges, with good grounds, the absence of all indication relative to the occasion and locality in connection with which this discourse was given, as well as the want of any new idea (see *Keim*, for example). But it falls into error in concluding from this that there is an artificial composition here which the evangelist places in the mouth of Jesus (*de Wette*), and in extending this conclusion to the discourses of Jesus, in general, in the fourth Gospel, discourses which are only the expression of the author's own thoughts (*Baur, Reuss, Hilgenfeld*).

Is it admissible that the evangelist himself would have ever dreamed, at this point of his narrative, of presenting to us a discourse of Jesus as really uttered by him? This is, indeed, what those suppose who make Him speak thus on going out from the temple (*Lampe, Bengel*), or at the time when he re-entered it again after the departure mentioned in ver. 36 (*Chrysostom, Hengstenberg*), or in a private conversation in presence of His disciples (*Besser, Luthardt*, 1st ed.). Of these three suppositions, the first two clash with ver. 36, which evidently indicates the closing of the public ministry of Jesus. The third, withdrawn by *Luthardt* himself (2d ed.), has against it the term *ἐκραζε* (*he cried aloud*.) What, in addition, excludes the idea of a discourse really delivered by Jesus at this time, is that the passage contains only a series of reminiscences of all the previous teachings, and that it is the only one which is destitute of any indication of occasion, time and place. The evangelist has with ver. 36 ended his part as *narrator* as to this portion of the history. In ver. 37 he contemplates the mysterious fact which he has just described and *meditates* on its causes and consequences. There is then here a discourse composed by John, indeed; but he does not attribute it as such to Jesus; he gives it as the summary of all the testimonies of Jesus which the Jews ought to have believed, but which they rejected. Here precisely is the reason why this passage contains no new idea, and bears no indication of time or place. The aorists (*ἐκραζε, εἶπεν*), recall all the particular cases in which Jesus had pronounced such affirmations respecting Himself; they must be rendered thus: "And yet He had sufficiently said . . . , He had sufficiently cried aloud . . ." Or as *Bäumlein* expresses it: "Jesus hatte aber laut erklärt." This interpretation forces itself more and more upon modern exegesis. Hence it follows that each one of the following declarations will rest upon a certain number of passages included in the preceding discourses. To the rejection of the miracles of Jesus which were the testimony of *God*, (vv. 37-43), Jewish unbelief has added the rejection of the testimony of *Jesus* respecting Himself.

Vv. 44-46. "Now Jesus cried, saying, He that believes on me, believes not on

me, but on him that sent me; 45 and he that beholds me, beholds him that sent me; 46 I am come as a light into the world, that whosoever believes on me, may not abide in the darkness." How many times had not Jesus borne witness to His full communion with the Father, that relation in which nothing obscured the manifestation in His person of this invisible Father of whom He was the organ! To believe on Him, is therefore to penetrate by the act of faith through the human person of Jesus even to the infinite source of every good which appears in Him (v. 19, 20; vi. 57; viii. 16, 29, 38; x. 30, 38).

The negation: *He believes not on me*, has its complete truth in this sense—that the believer does not believe on the man Jesus as if He were come or had acted in His own name (ver. 43); in Jesus, it is really God, and God only, who is the object of faith, since God alone appears in Him. It is not, therefore, necessary, to give to *not* the sense of *not only*. The sight, which is in question in ver. 45, is that which is developed along with faith itself, the intuition of the inmost being of the person who is beheld. As to the correlation of the two acts so intimately connected, *believing* and *beholding*, see vi. 40, 69. Jesus, the living revelation of God, becomes, by means of this spiritual sight, the light of the soul (iii. 19; viii. 12; ix. 5, 39). Thus he who believes in Jesus possesses God and by his faith attests the truth of God to the view of others (iii. 33). What importance there is for a human being in the acceptance of such a manifestation! To the importance of faith corresponds that of the refusal to believe.

Vv. 47, 48. "*And if any one hear my sayings and keep<sup>1</sup> them not, I judge him not; for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world. 48. He that rejects me and receives not my sayings has already his judge; the word which I have spoken, this it is which will judge him at the last day.*" Woe to him who does not believe on Jesus and His word in which He manifests Himself and bears testimony of Himself! As His presence is the pure manifestation of God, His word is the perfect revelation of the thought of God. This will be the one touchstone of the judgment. The declaration of ver. 47 does not exclude the personal role of Jesus in this great act. It merely says that the sentence which He will pronounce at that time will be simply that which will follow from the position which the man has taken with regard to His word; it is the idea of iii. 18 (*ἡ δὴ κέκρηται*), v. 24; viii. 15. The reading *φυλάξῃ*, *keep*, is to be preferred to the received reading *πιστεύσῃ* (and *believe not*); for the former term is less common than the latter; it applies not to the keeping in the conduct—with this meaning, Jesus employs the word *τηρεῖν*—but to inward appropriation and possession. The last words of ver. 47 reproduce the idea of iii. 17; comp. ix. 39, 41.

In ver. 48, where the rejection of Jesus is identified with that of His words, the express mention of the *last day* is very remarkable. As Gess observes, "the moral judgment of humanity through the word is incessantly effected even now, according to the entire Gospel. And yet the notion of the last judgment is so indispensable in the thought of the

<sup>1</sup> N A B K L X some Mss. Italic, Syriac, read *φυλάξῃ* (*keeps*) instead of *πιστεύσῃ* (*believes*).

evangelist, that he expresses it here as the limit without which the purely moral judgment would fail of its consummation" (II. p. 452). How is it that *Reuss, Scholten, Hilgenfeld* affirm that the final judgment is denied in our Gospel! And what is striking is that the evangelist mentions, in speaking thus, a fact which is not indicated in the saying of Jesus on which this is founded (iii. 17). The last two verses explain the reason why the position taken by man with regard to Jesus and His word has so decisive an importance. It is because He has nothing of His own mingled in His teaching, and that He has transmitted it, as to substance and form, exactly as He received it from the Father.

Vv. 49, 50. "*For I have not spoken from myself; but the Father who sent me has himself given me commandment<sup>1</sup> what I should say and how I should say it; 50 and I know that his commandment is life eternal; what I say therefore I say even as my Father has said to me.*" If the word of Jesus is the standard of judgment, it is because it is that of God Himself, both as to substance (τί εἶπω) and as to form (τί λαλήσω). The ἐντολή, the commandment, of which Jesus here speaks is not a mandate received once for all before leaving heaven. This idea is incompatible with iii. 34, v. 19, 20, 30, viii. 16 (see *Gess*, pp. 542, 543). Jesus receives for each case the commission which He has to fulfill; He hears before speaking, and He hears because He listens. This constant docility arises in Him (ver. 50) from the certainty which he has of the vivifying and regenerating force of that word which the Father intrusts to Him. Whatever may be the objections which it excites, or the doubts which are set in opposition to it, He is conscious of its virtue by means of which it produces in souls *eternal life*. For this reason (*even as*, ver. 50b), He gives it to men just as He receives it, without allowing Himself to make any change in it. Comp. v. 30; vii. 16, 17; viii. 28; then vi. 63, 68.

John formulates very exactly in these few propositions the absolute value which Jesus had constantly attributed to His person and His word. This summary cannot be that of a discourse which the evangelist had the consciousness of having himself composed. It is not possible that he would have drawn up this formidable charge against the unbelief of Israel in the name of discourses which Jesus had never given; still more impossible that he could have founded his indictment, in ver. 37, on miracles which were only inventions of his own. To attribute to him such a mode of proceeding would be to make him a shameless impostor or a madman. And what is to be thought of the writer who should put into the mouth of Jesus these words: "*I have said nothing from myself; my Father has commanded me what I should say, and how I should say it,*" and who should make Him say this, while having the consciousness of having himself made Him speak all along and of making Him still do so at this time? Are there not enough impossibilities here? Let us remark also how this retrospective glance, interrupting the narrative, fails of appropriateness if we suppose it to have been composed in the second century, at a time when the question of the rejection by the Jews was no longer an actuality; on the contrary, how natural it is on the part of a man who was himself an eye-witness of this abnormal and unexpected fact of Jewish unbelief.

<sup>1</sup> K A B M X 30 Mnn. read δέδωκεν instead of ἐδωκεν.

Before leaving this second part of the gospel story, let us cast a glance backward over the course of the narrative. We have seen in process of accomplishment before our eyes, through all the vicissitudes so dramatically described, the development of the national unbelief and the progressive separation between a people almost wholly fanaticized by its rulers and a feeble minority of believers. Well! Let us for an instant, by a thought, suppress this entire picture, all these journeys of Jesus to Jerusalem, all these conflicts in the very centre of the theocracy—as must be done as soon as we reject the credibility of our Gospel—behold, we are in presence of the final catastrophe attested by the Synoptics no less than by St. John: How are we to explain this sudden and tragic denouement? Only by the collisions which took place in a retired province of the Holy Land on occasion of a few Sabbath cures? No: the serious historian, even when accounting for the entrance on Palm-day, can never dispense with this whole series of conflicts in Jerusalem at which we have just been present.

## THIRD PART.

---

### THE DEVELOPMENT OF FAITH IN THE DISCIPLES.

#### XIII. 1—XVII. 26.

THE third part of the Gospel describes the last moments which Jesus passed with His disciples ; while making us acquainted with the supreme manifestations of His love towards them, it initiates us into the full development of *faith* in their hearts. John thus contrasts with the gloomy picture of Israelitish unbelief the luminous picture of the formation of faith in the future founders of the Church. Christ accomplishes this work in the hearts of His followers : 1. By two *acts*, the washing of their feet and the removal of Judas, through which He purifies the apostolic circle from the last remains of carnal Messianism ; 2. By a series of *discourses*, in which He prepares His disciples for the approaching separation, gives them the necessary instructions with a view to their future ministry and elevates their faith in His person to the highest point which it can reach at this moment ; 3. By a *prayer* of thanksgiving, by which he affixes the seal to His work now finished. Under the sway of these last manifestations, the faith of the disciples reaches its relative perfection, as fruits reach their maturity in the warm rays of the autumn sun. This faith is subjected to a double test, that of humiliation, through the deep humility of Jesus in the act of washing the feet, and that of self-sacrifice, through the prospect of a violent conflict to be met from the side of the world and a victory to be gained only through the spiritual force of Christ. With such prospects, what becomes of the earthly hopes which they still entertained in their hearts ? But the faith of the apostles comes forth from this test triumphant and purified. It has laid hold of the divine person of Christ : “ We believe that thou camest forth from God ” (xvi. 30). This is enough ; Jesus answers : “ *At last you believe* ” (xvi. 31). And He blesses His Father with an outpouring of thanks (chap. xvii.) for having given Him these eleven who believe in Him and who will bring the world to faith.

Thus therefore there are three sections :

1. Chap. xiii. 1–30 : The purification of the apostles' faith by two decisive facts.

2. Chap. xiii. 31–xvi. 33 : The strengthening and development of this faith by the last teachings of Jesus, which contain the final revelation of His person.

3. Chap. xvii. : The thanksgiving for this earthly ministry now ended.

## FIRST SECTION.

## XIII. 1-30.

## THE FACTS.

1. The washing of the disciples' feet : vv. 1-20.
2. The removal of Judas : vv. 21-30.

I.—*The washing of the disciples' feet* : vv. 1-20.

This section includes a preamble (vv. 1-3), the fact (vv. 4-11), finally, the explanation of the fact (vv. 12-20).

## 1. Vv. 1-3: Preamble.

We have already discovered at the beginning of several narratives short introductions describing the situation, at once external and moral, in which the fact about to be related is accomplished; thus ii. 23-25; iii. 22-24; iv. 1, 2, 43-45. Each of these preambles is, with relation to the narrative which is to follow, what the Prologue i. 1-18 is for the whole Gospel, a general glance fitted to give the reader acquaintance with the subject in advance. Such is the design of the preamble in vv. 1-3. And as the substance of the general Prologue is borrowed from the teaching of Jesus in the sequel of our Gospel, so in the same way, as we easily discover, this particular preamble is entirely derived from the facts and discourses which will follow.

Ver. 1. "*Before the feast of the Passover, Jesus, knowing that his hour was come,<sup>1</sup> when he should leave this world to go to the Father, after having loved his own<sup>2</sup> who were in the world, he perfectly testified to them all his love.*" The words *before the feast of the Passover* are connected with the preceding determination of time: *six days before the Passover* (xii. 1), but with a difference of expression which cannot be accidental. There it was said: "*Before the Passover,*" a word which designates, as ordinarily, the Paschal supper on the evening which ended the 14th of Nisan (Exod. xii.; Lev. xxiii. 5; Num. xxviii. 16). Here John says: "*Before the feast of the Passover;*" this wider term undoubtedly includes the entire day of the 14th of Nisan on which the leaven was removed from all the Israelite dwellings, and which was already counted for this reason among the days appertaining to *the feast*. This appears from Num. xxxiii. 3 (comp. also Josh. v. 11), where the day of the 15th Nisan is designated as the morrow after the Passover (LXX.: τῆ ἐπαύριον τοῦ πάσχα). To prove that the 14th could not be included in the feast, Keil cites Lev. xxiii. 6; Num. xxviii. 17; but it must not be forgotten that in these last passages the complement of the word *the feast* is not of *the Passover*, but of *unleavened bread* (τῶν ἀζύμων); the eating of the unleavened bread began indeed only with the Paschal supper, on the evening of the 14th-15th, to continue seven days until the 21st. This was the week of unleavened bread. If, then, we include the

<sup>1</sup> T. R. with the Byz. (E F G H etc.) reads . . . <sup>2</sup> X: Ἰουδαίους (*the Jews*) instead of ἰδιους ἢ ἐληλυθεν; the Alex. (X B K L etc.): ἡλθεν.

day of the 14th in the expression *the feast of the Passover* in xiii. 1, the expression *before the feast of the Passover* places us, at the latest, on the evening of the 13th. But if, on the contrary, we identify, as some interpreters do (*Hengstenberg, Lange, Hofmann, Luthardt, Keil*, etc.), the beginning of the feast with the very moment of the Paschal supper, then this expression places us on the evening of the 14th, a few moments before the opening of this sacred supper. We shall see later the importance of this difference of explanation. This chronological determination refers naturally to the principal verb: *ἠγάπησεν, he loved*. As this verb expresses a feeling existing habitually in the heart of Jesus, and not an historical act, some interpreters have denied this reference. Some have made this determination of time: *before the feast*, refer to the verb *ἐγείρεται, rises*, ver. 4 (*Bleck, de Wette*); but what, in this case, can we do with the verb *ἠγάπησεν, he loved*? There is not the least indication of a parenthesis. Others endeavor to make this determination of time refer to the participle *εἰδώς, knowing*, (*Luthardt*, 1st ed., *Riggenbach*), or to *ἠγαπήσας, having loved*, (*Wieseler, Tholuck*). But, placed as it is, at the beginning of this whole section, this chronological indication can refer only to the principal action, the indication of which governs it altogether: *ἠγάπησε, he loved*. And this relation, which is the most simple, is also that which offers the best sense. How could John say that Jesus had been conscious of His approaching departure (*εἰδώς*) or had loved (*ἠγαπήσας*) His own *before the feast*? The verb *ἀγαπᾶν, to love*, must designate here, as appears from the aorist, not the feeling only, but also its external manifestations (especially those the story of which is to follow). John means that it was on the evening before the first day of the feast, when He was going to leave His followers, that Jesus manifested all His love for them and in some sort surpassed Himself in the testimonies which He gave them of this feeling.

To this first determination of a chronological nature, a second of a moral nature is attached: "*Jesus, knowing that . . .*" It was while having the perfectly distinct consciousness of His impending departure that Jesus acted and spoke as John is about to relate to us. This thought presided over these last manifestations of His love. *Hengstenberg* and others connect this participle with the principal verb through the idea of a contrast: "*Although He knew indeed . . . , nevertheless He loved and humbled Himself thus,*" as if the prospect of His future exaltation could have been for Jesus a hindrance in the way of acting as He does! John had no need to deny a supposition so absurd. He means, on the contrary, that *because* He saw the hour of separation approaching, He redoubled His tenderness towards those whom He had until then so faithfully loved. Who does not know how the foreseeing of an imminent separation renders affection more demonstrative! Thus most,—*His own*: those whom He had gained by His love. There is a deliberate antithesis between the terms: *the Father*, with whom all is rest, and *the world*, where all is conflict and peril. Then, a third determination, serving to connect the act of *ἠγάπησε, he loved*, with an entire past of the same character which this last evening was going to

complete. The expression: *His hour was come*, forms a contrast with that which we have so often met: "*His hour was not yet come.*"

The phrase *εις τέλος*, for the end, does not have in classical Greek the sense *until the end*; at least, *Passow* does not cite a single example of it; to express this idea of duration, the classical writers said rather *διὰ τέλους*. In the New Testament we can scarcely fail to find the meaning *until the end* in the *εις τέλος* of Matt. x. 22 and the parallels (though the idea of duration is found rather in the verb *shall persevere*). But the phrases ordinarily employed in this sense are either *ἕως τέλους*, or *μέχρι* or *ἄχρι τέλους*; 1 Cor. i. 8; 2 Cor. i. 13 (*ἕως*); Heb. vi. 14 (*μέχρι*); and Apoc. ii. 26 (*ἄχρι*). But what prevents us from accepting this meaning here which is adopted by our versions, is that it would be useless. Was it then necessary to affirm that Jesus *did not cease* to love his own up to the moment when He died for them? The true meaning of *εις τέλος* in the New Testament, as in the classics, is *for the end*, that is to say, sometimes: *at the end*, at the last moment; sometimes, *to the utmost, to make an end of it*. The first of these two meanings is certainly that which must be adopted in Luke xviii. 5: "lest she come *at the end* even to wearying me"; the second is found in 1 Thess. ii. 6: "the wrath is come upon them *to the utmost*," that is to say, to make an end of it with them, in manifesting itself completely. Comp. the *εις τέλος* in the LXX., Josh. x. 20 (even to an entire destruction); 2 Chron. xii. 12, xxx. 1, and a multitude of other examples in the Psalms of Solomon and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (*Hilgenfeld, Einl.*, p. 243). In our passage, this meaning seems to me the only possible one. But the question is of love, and not of wrath. This phrase signifies therefore: the manifestation of His love even to its complete outpouring, in a way to exhaust it, in some sort. As an analogy to the sense of *ἠγάπησε*, *he loved*, including the feeling and its manifestations, *Odyss.* ψ, 214, may be cited, where Penelope says to Ulysses: "Pardon me that I did not immediately on first seeing you love you as much as (*ὡδ' ἠγάπησα*) I now do when I press you in my arms."

This first verse must be regarded as forming the preamble, not of this chapter only, but of this whole part of the Gospel, chaps. xiii.-xvii. We shall see, indeed, that it is in the discourses of chaps. xiv.-xvi., and in the prayer of chap. xvii., much more than in chap. xiii., that the thoughts of Jesus which are summed up by John in the *knowing that* of ver. 1 come to light; comp. xiv. 12: "*I go to my ather*," xv. 18: "*If the world hate you, you know that it hated me before you*," xvi. 28: "*I leave the world and go to my Father*," xvi. 33: "*You shall have tribulation in the world*," xvii. 11: "*I am no more in the world, but they are in the world, and I come to thee*." Comp. also xiii. 34; xv. 9, 11, 14; xvii. 23, 24, 26, etc. But—and this it is which it seems to me has not been sufficiently marked—with the second verse, there begins a second more particular preamble, relating only to the scene described in the following narrative (chap. xiii.). This second preamble, like the first, contains three determinations; one of *time*; a supper having taken place; the second, relating to the *present condition* of things: "the devil having already put into the heart . . ."; the third,

of a *moral* nature: "Jesus, knowing that . . ." We easily discover the correspondence of these three determinations with the facts and conversions of the following narrative. They serve to place in a clear light the thought of Jesus during the scenes which are immediately to follow, those of the washing of the disciples' feet and of the dismissal of Judas.

Vv. 2, 3. "*And a supper having taken place,*<sup>1</sup> *when the devil had already put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon, to betray him,*<sup>2</sup> *3 Jesus*<sup>3</sup> *knowing that the Father had given*<sup>4</sup> *all things into his hands, and that he came from God and went to God."* And first, the temporal determination: *a supper having taken place*. The Alexandrian reading *γινομένου*, *taking place*, seems to me inadmissible. This expression could scarcely refer to anything but the Paschal supper: "While this supper took place Jesus rises." But for this it would be necessary that the article *τοῦ*, *the*, should be wanting, that is to say, that the substantive should have been sufficiently determined by what precedes, which is not the case since the first words of ver. 1: "*before the feast of the Passover*" are rather suited to set aside the idea of the Paschal feast than to give rise to it. The present or imperfect, *taking place*, appears to me to be an adaptation, by the copyists, of this participle to the present *ἐγείρεται*, *he rises*, of ver. 4. It was not understood that the descriptive present *rises* might perfectly accord with the past tense of the participle: "(a) supper having taken place, Jesus rises." It does not appear to me possible that this supper can be the Israelite Paschal supper. The word *δείπνου*, designating that solemn supper, must necessarily have been marked by the article. The second determination is expressed in the two Alexandrian and Byzantine texts in two quite different forms; the Byzantine: "*the devil having already put into the heart of Judas that he should betray him.*" The Alexandrian: "*the devil having already put into the heart that Judas Iscariot, son of Simon, should betray him.*" Into whose heart? That of the devil, *Meyer* and *Reuss* answer. They take the Greek phrase: *to put into the heart*, in the sense of: to conceive the design of. But this sense is not tolerable. And where in Scripture is the devil's heart spoken of? Then, one does not put a thought into one's own heart. And why not say *ἐαυτοῦ* (*of himself*)? Finally, since when does the devil dispose of men in such a way that it is enough for him to decide to make one of them a traitor, in order that this one should indeed become a traitor. It must therefore be explained: put into the heart of *Judas* (*Bäumlein*, *Luthardt*, *Weiss*); but this term: *into the heart*, could not be thus used absolutely and without any complement fitted to define it. This reading is therefore inadmissible. It is probably due to a correction resting on the false idea that the fact expressed by the received reading

<sup>1</sup> *Γινόμενου* (*taking place*) is read in  $\aleph$  (*γενομένου*), B L X Orig. (4 times), instead of *γενομένου* (*having taken place*) which T. R. reads with all the other Mjj. all the Mnn. and Vss. Orig. (once).

<sup>2</sup>  $\aleph$  B L M X It<sup>all</sup>, Vulg. Orig. (7 times) read *του διαβ. ἡδὴ βεβληκ. εἰς τ. καρδ. ἵνα παραδῶ αὐτον Ἰουδας Σ. Ἰσκαριωτης*. But T. R. with 11

Mjj., the Mnn., It<sup>plurique</sup>, Syr., Orig. (3 times), reads *του διαβ. ἡδὴ βεβληκ. εἰς τ. καρδ. Ἰουδα Σ. Ἰσκαριωτου ἵνα αὐτον παραδῶ*.  $\aleph$  B D; *παραδοί* instead of *παραδῶ*.

<sup>3</sup>  $\aleph$  B D L X do not repeat ο Ἰησους here.

<sup>4</sup>  $\aleph$  B D K L Orig.: *εδῶκεν* instead of *δεδῶκεν*.

would constitute an anticipation of that which is to be related afterwards in ver. 27; but wrongly; for at the moment when the supper took place, the treachery was really consummated in the heart of Judas; still more, according to the Synoptics, everything was already agreed upon between him and the Sanhedrim. The Byzantine reading simply says: *the devil having already put into the heart of Judas . . . that he should betray him.* The design of this indication is not to set forth the long-suffering and benevolence of Jesus (*Chrysostom, Calvin, Luthardt*), or the perfect clearness of mind with which He goes to meet His fate (*Meyer*); nor again to indicate that time was pressing (*Lücke*). John wishes to give grounds for the different allusions which Jesus is about to make to the presence of the traitor throughout the whole course of the following scene (comp. vv. 10, 18, 21, 26) and especially to explain the conduct and the severe word of Jesus in ver. 27. The Alexandrian reading *παράδοι*, instead of *παράδω* (T. R.), is explained in two ways by the grammarians: either as a contraction of the optative *παράδοιη* (see in *Kühner, Ausführl. Gramm.* a multitude of examples taken from Plato and other authors), or as a contraction of the subjunctive *δόη*, from *δῶω* (for *δίδομι*); so *Bäumlein*, after *Buttmann*. As the first determination: *a feast having taken place*, answers to the first of ver. 1 (*before the feast*), so the reflection (*the devil having put . . .*) answers to that of ver. 1: *having loved his own*. The blackest hatred forms the counterpart to the most tender love.

The picture of the external and moral situation is completed by a third indication which helps us to penetrate into the inner feeling of Jesus and unveils to us the true meaning of the act of humiliation which is about to follow: "*Jesus knowing that . . .*" This *knowing* is by no means the resumption of that of ver. 1; for it has a quite different content. It is not the sorrowful feeling of the approaching separation: it is the consciousness of His greatness which inspires in Him the act of humiliation which He is going to accomplish. Here, more frequently even than in ver. 1, the commentators interpret in the sense of: "*Although knowing; although feeling Himself so great, He humbled Himself.*" This is, according to our view, to misconceive, even more seriously than in ver. 1, the evangelist's thought, as well as that of Jesus Himself. It is not *in spite of* His divine greatness, it is *because of* this very greatness, that Jesus humbles Himself, as He is going to do. Feeling Himself the greatest, He understands that it belongs to Him to give the model of real greatness, by humbling Himself to the lowest part; for greatness in the Messianic kingdom which He comes to inaugurate on the earth, consists in voluntary humiliation. This kind of greatness, still unknown here on earth, *His own* must at this moment behold in Him, to the end that His Church may never recognize any other. It is therefore *inasmuch as* He is Lord, and not *although* He is Lord, that He is going to discharge the office of a slave. Moreover, it is Jesus Himself who expresses this idea (vv. 13, 14): "*You call me Master and Lord . . . If then,*" and it is from these words that it is derived. Hence we understand the accumulation of clauses which recall to mind the features of the supreme greatness of Jesus: 1.

His sovereign *position*: everything is put into His hands; 2. His divine *origin*: He comes from God; 3. His divine destiny: He returns to God (the repetition of the word *God* is to be remarked). It is in the consciousness of what He is, that He does what no other has ever done. The example becomes thus for His own decisive, irresistible: the servant cannot remain with proud bearing when the Master humbles Himself before him.

2. Vv. 4-11: The fact.

Vv. 4, 5. "[Jesus] *rises from the supper and lays aside his garments; and, taking a towel, he girds himself.* 5. *Then he pours water into the basin; and he began to wash the feet of his disciples and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded.*" Ver. 3 has initiated us in advance into the meaning of this act. If need were, this would suffice to explain the reason of it. So *Ewald* and *Meyer* do not seek to find any outward motive. Jesus, however, does not act, in general, by a mere impulse from within; He yields to a given occasion in which He discerns the signal from the Father. St. Luke relates to us, xxii. 24-27, that there arose at the supper a dispute among the disciples on the question to whom the first place among them belonged. Whereupon Jesus said: "The first among you must take the place of the last." Then, giving Himself as an example: "Who is greater, he that sits at meat or he that serves? But I am among you as he that serves." This answer of Jesus might be applied to His way of acting, in general, in the midst of His own; and it is thus, perhaps, that it was understood by Luke to whom this saying of the Lord had been handed down as separated from the story with which we are now occupied. But for ourselves, knowing the act which Jesus performed at this supper, it is impossible not to connect it with the saying and explain the latter by the former. The washing of the feet was undoubtedly occasioned by the dispute of which Luke speaks. Jesus wished to eradicate from the hearts of His disciples the last remnant of the old leaven of pride and Messianic ambition which still infected their faith and manifested itself in so offensive a manner in the discussion of which Luke has preserved the remembrance. But why give this form to the lesson which He desired to leave with His followers at this final meeting? Luke places the dispute at the very end of the supper, and, if necessary, it might be supposed that, being pained by the fact that no one of them at the beginning of the meal had offered to discharge this humble office, and that, in consequence, the washing of the feet had not taken place, Jesus had at first kept His feeling to Himself, but afterwards, an opportunity presenting itself, He expressed it precisely as He did in the case mentioned in Luke vii. 44. The washing thus was performed, as a mere example, at the end of the supper. The natural place, however, for such a ceremony is at the beginning of the meal, and it may be easily supposed that Luke placed as a supplementary detail in the account of the meal a fact which he knew belonged to it, but the exact moment of which he did not know. Indeed, he simply says: "*There was also a dispute.*" Jesus was already seated at table (ver. 4); the apostles took their places (vv. 6, 12). It was perhaps on this occasion that

the dispute broke out, each claiming to have the right to be seated next to the Saviour. At this moment Jesus rises and, by charging Himself with the humble office which each one of them should have spontaneously hastened to perform, He gives them to understand who is really the greatest in His kingdom. The matter in hand here is not indeed to give His disciples a lesson of kindness, of condescension, of mutual serviceableness. Comp. vv. 13-15, and especially ver. 10 which, from this point of view, is no longer intelligible. Jesus wishes to teach them that the condition for *entering* and *advancing* in a kingdom like His own, is the reverse of what takes place on earth, to know how to humble oneself, to efface oneself; and that, the more each one shall outstrip the other in this divine art, the more he will become like Him, at first in spirit, and then in glory.

Each feature of the following picture betrays the recollection of an eyewitness; John describes this scene as if beholding it at this very moment. Jesus assumes the garb of a slave. *His garments*: here, the upper garment. Jesus keeps only the tunic, the garment of the slave. He girds Himself with a towel, because He must carry the basin with both hands. *Νιπτήρα*, with the article: *the* basin, the one which was there for this purpose and which belonged to the furniture of the dining-hall. *Nihil ministerii omittit*, says *Grotius*.

Vv. 6-11. "He comes therefore to Simon Peter, and he<sup>1</sup> says to him, Lord,<sup>1</sup> Dost thou wash my feet? 7. Jesus answered and said to him, What<sup>2</sup> I do, thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter. 8. Peter says to him, No, thou shalt never wash my feet. Jesus answered him, If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me. 9. Simon Peter says to him, Lord,<sup>3</sup> not only my feet, but also my hands and my head. 10. Jesus says to him, He that is bathed has need of nothing except to wash his feet,<sup>4</sup> but he is altogether clean; and you are clean, but not all. 11. For he knew him that should betray him; therefore said he,<sup>5</sup> You are not all clean." It must be observed, indeed, that this conversation with St. Peter comes upon this scene as an unexpected episode. *ὄν*, therefore (ver. 6): when going from one to another according to the order in which they were seated. The natural conclusion to be drawn from this *therefore* is that Peter was not the first whose feet Jesus washed; he was not seated therefore beside Him (comp. ver. 24). The feeling of reverence which called forth this resistance on Peter's part expresses itself in the antithesis of the pronouns *σὺ*, *thou*, and *μοῦ*, *me*, and in the title *Lord*. Here, as in Matt. xvi. 22, it is respect which produces in this apostle the want of respect. The antithesis of *ἐγώ* and *σὺ* (*I—thou*) in ver. 7, answers to that of *σὺ* and *μοῦ* (*thou—me*) in ver. 6. The expression *μετὰ ταῦτα*, *hereafter*, signifies according to *Chrysostom*, *Grotius*, *Tholuck*, *Reuss*: by the light which the experiences of thy future ministry will give. But the relation between *γνώσῃ*, *thou shalt know*, and *γνώσκετε*, *know ye* (ver. 14),

<sup>1</sup> **Ν** B omit: *εκεῖνος*; **Ν** omits *κυριε* (*Lord*).

<sup>2</sup> **Ν** reads *α* *εγω* instead of *ο* *εγω*.

<sup>3</sup> **Ν** rejects *κυριε* (*Lord*).

<sup>4</sup> T. R. with A E G M S U F Δ A: *η* *τους* *ποδας* *νιπασθαι* (*than to wash his feet*); B C K

L: *ει* *μη* *τους* *ποδας* *νιπασθαι* (*if not to wash his feet*); **Ν** *ο* *νιπασθαι* (*has no need to wash, but*).

<sup>5</sup> B C L add *οτι*.

shows that Jesus is thinking rather of the explanation which He is about to give at the very moment, after having finished the act which was begun.

The gentleness of Jesus emboldens Peter; he had only questioned (ver. 6); now he positively refuses, and even for ever. If this refusal of Peter springs from modesty, it is nevertheless true that, as *Weiss* says, this modesty is not destitute of self-will and pride. Jesus answers him in the same categorical tone, and there is certainly an echo of Peter's *for ever* in the *no part with me* of Jesus. This relation it is which prevents us from holding, with *Weiss* and *Reuss*, that these words mean: "Thou dost not at this moment share in my feelings," or "Thou art not in communion with me" (present, *ἔχεις, thou hast*). The *ἔχεις* may perfectly well be a present of anticipation and may refer to the blessedness to come. The phrase *μέρος ἔχειν μετά, to have part with*, indicates the participation of the inferior in the booty, the riches, the glory of his leader (Josh. xxii. 24; 2 Sam. xx. 1; 1 Kings xii. 16). The refusal of Peter to accept the humiliating service which Jesus desires to render him, is equivalent to a rejection of the spirit of His work, to the resolution to persevere in the love of the carnal grandeur from which precisely Jesus desires by this act to purify His disciples. In rejecting the humiliation which his Master imposes upon Himself for his sake, Peter rejects in principle that which he was one day to impose upon himself for the sake of his brethren. The reply of Jesus is in harmony with this meaning; it reproduces with a natural force the warning which He addressed to all the disciples, on occasion of a quite similar dispute among them: "*Except you are converted and become as little children*, not only will no one of you be the greatest in the kingdom of heaven, but *you will not enter into it at all*" (Matt. xviii. 1-4).

Ver. 9 presents to us, in the case of Peter, one of those sudden changes of impression which we frequently observe in him, in the Synoptic narrative. Here is the same Peter who rushes upon the water and a moment afterward cries "I perish!" who strikes with the sword and who takes to flight, who enters into the house of the high-priest and yet denies his Master. The perfect accordance between these scattered features, and the image full of life which results from them, admirably prove in this case as in all the others, as *Luthardt* has so well set forth, the complete reality of the Gospel history. The whole meaning of the act of Jesus was in the fact of washing *the feet*. The nature of the act changed absolutely as soon as it concerned the head, for in that case it was no longer an act of humiliation. Jesus follows Peter on this new ground and this is what introduces the different meaning given to the act in His answer. At the foundation, what Peter asked for, without being conscious of it, was, instead of the removal of a stain, a complete renovation and, as it were, a second baptism; he implicitly denied the work already done in him (xv. 3). This is what gives the key to the answer of Jesus. This answer has of course a double meaning. Jesus rises immediately, as in the conversation with the Samaritan woman, from the material to the spiritual domain. As after having bathed in the morning, a man regards himself as clean for

the whole day and contents himself with washing his feet when he returns from without, that he may remove the accidental soiling which they have contracted in walking, so he who, by earnestly attaching himself to Christ, has broken with sin once for all, has no need at each particular defilement to begin anew this general consecration; he has only to cleanse himself from this stain by confession and recourse to Christ. We must recall here what Jesus says to His disciples, xv. 3: "You are already clean through the word which I have declared to you." In receiving His word, they had received in principle the perfect holiness of which it is the standard in the life in Him. There is nothing more except to change the law into act by ever placing oneself anew on the foundation which has been laid. *Weiss* thinks that all notion of *pardon* in the symbol of washing is foreign to this context. But the fundamental rupture with sin which Jesus compares to the *complete bath*, implies a general pardon and reconciliation with God, and each act of destroying a particular sin, represented by the *washing of the feet*, implies the particular pardon of that sin. *Reuss* objects that the answer of Jesus, thus explained, would turn aside the symbol from its primitive sense. We have seen that the sense of the symbol was altogether different from that of the disposition towards kindness to one's neighbor; that Jesus desired to eradicate a bad propensity from the hearts of the disciples. This is what gives occasion to the new turn which the explanation of the symbol takes in consequence of the demand of Peter. I believe with *Reuss*, that, whatever *Weiss* may say, Jesus is here thinking of the baptism of water, the symbol of general purification, and means that it is no more necessary to renew this act (that which Peter asked) than that of faith itself whose symbol it is. The reading *εἰ μή, if it is not*, in a few Alexandrian documents, is a correction of the *ἤ*, in the T. R., which is slightly irregular; *ἤ, than*, for *οὐδενός ἄλλου ἤ, nothing else than*. The rejection of the words *ἢ τοὺς πόδας*, in the *Sinaitic MS.*, completely changes the meaning: "He who is bathed has no need to wash himself; but he is all clean." This reading is a correction occasioned by the difficulty of distinguishing between the total bath and the partial washing. The last words: "*but he is clean altogether*," are to be explained thus: "*But, far from having to bathe entirely a second time, as thou dost demand, his body is, in general clean. It is enough to cleanse the local defilement which the feet have contracted.*"

But is this state of reconciliation and consecration indeed the state of all? No; there is a disciple who has broken the bond connecting him with Jesus or in whose heart this bond has never existed. He it is who would really have need of the inward act of which Peter had just asked for the symbol. Here is the first revelation of the treachery of Judas, in the course of the supper. By expressing in this way the grief which the thought of this crime causes Him to feel, Jesus makes a last effort to bring Judas to repentance. And if He does not succeed, He will, at least, have shown to His disciples that He was not the dupe of his hypocrisy (ver. 19).

### 3. Vv. 12-20: The explanation.

Vv. 12-17. "When therefore he had washed their<sup>1</sup> feet and<sup>2</sup> taken his garments again, having resumed his seat at table,<sup>3</sup> he said to them, Know you what I have done to you? 13. You call me Master and Lord,<sup>4</sup> and you say well, for so I am. 14. If I then, the Lord and the Master, have washed your feet, you also<sup>5</sup> ought to wash one another's feet. 15. For I have given<sup>6</sup> you an example, that, as I have done to you, you also may do. 16. Verily, verily, I say unto you that the servant is not greater than his lord, nor he that is sent greater than he that sent him. 17. If you know these things, happy are you, if you do them." Jesus feared nothing for His Church so much as hierarchical pretensions. The disciples knew that their Master was establishing a kingdom. This single word was fitted to awaken in them ideas of dominion in the earthly sense; for this reason He shows them that, in this kingdom, the means of mounting higher is to descend, and the way to the first place is to put oneself without hesitation in the last. In ver. 13, *ye call me* properly means: You designate me thus when you address to me the word: *thee, Master*. Hence the two substantives in the nominative. The title of *Master* refers to teaching; that of *Lord*, to dominion over the entire life. It is the reproducing of the titles *Rabbi* and *Mar* which Jewish pupils gave to their masters. The most exalted title, that of *Lord*, is placed second, agreeably to the natural gradation. The T. R. accords here with the Alexandrian authorities. It is from the words: *For so I am*, that John has properly derived the *εἰδώς, knowing*, of ver. 3. Since the fourth century, the Church has discovered in vv. 14, 15, the institution of a rite; and it is well known what this ceremony has become where it is still practised in a literal sense.<sup>7</sup> But neither the term *ὑπόδειγμα, example*, nor the plural, *these things* (ver. 17), suits the idea of an institution; and, in ver. 15, Jesus would have been obliged to say *ὅ, that which*, instead of *καθώς, as*. To humble oneself in order to serve, and to serve in order to save: such is the moral essence of this act, its permanent element. The form was accidental and, as we have seen, borrowed from the given situation, consequently a passing thing. The washing of the feet which is mentioned in 1 Tim. v. 10 is a duty of hospitality and is only in a moral relation with what is prescribed in vv. 14, 15. The meaning of the sentence in ver. 16, which is also found in the Synoptics, but with a different application (Luke vi. 40; Matt. x. 24, 25; comp. John xv. 20) is here, as in Matt. x., that the subordinate should not consider unworthy of him that which his superior has consented to do. But the Lord knows that it is

<sup>1</sup> N reads *αυτου (his)* instead of *αυτων (their)*.

<sup>2</sup> N A L Itlperique Syr. omit *και* before *ελαβεν*.

<sup>3</sup> Instead of *αναπεσων*, N B C Syr. read *και αναπεσεν* and A L Itlperique *και αναπεσων*.

<sup>4</sup> 6 Mjj. (Byz.) read *ο κυρ. και ο διδασκ.*; T. R. with all the rest (12 Mjj.); *ο διδ. και ο κυρ (the Master and the Lord)*.

<sup>5</sup> D Itlperique Syr. read *ποσω μαλλον (how much more)* before *και υμεις*.

<sup>6</sup> N A K M Π: *δεδωκα* instead of *εδωκα* (13 Mjj.).

<sup>7</sup> See in *Westcott* the summary history of this rite, declared obligatory by a council held in Toledo (694), celebrated in the churches of Spain and Gaul, performed on Holy Thursday by the Pope as the representative of Christ, received also in the Greek Church, where it is maintained in the convents, combated by the reformers; adopted in England from Wolsey (1530) to the reign of James II.; also by the Mennonites in Holland and by the Moravian Church in which it has fallen into disuse.

easier to approve and admire humility than to practise it; for this reason He adds the words of ver. 17. *Ei, if*, "if truly;" as is really the case; it is the general supposition; *éav, in case that*; it is the more particular condition. The happiness of which Jesus speaks is not merely that of *knowing* the duty of voluntary humility (*Westcott*), nor the inward delight which the disciple enjoys in performing it (*Weiss*); it is an actual superiority of position before God henceforth and in the future economy. A man is so much greater in the view of Jesus and so much nearer to Him in proportion as he consents to humble himself the more, as He did, in order to serve his brethren (*Matt. xviii. 4*).

Vv. 18, 19. "*I do not say this of you all; I know those whom<sup>2</sup> I have chosen; but that the Scripture may be fulfilled, He who eats bread with me<sup>3</sup> has lifted up<sup>4</sup> his heel against me.*" 19. *From henceforth I tell you before it comes to pass, that when it is come to pass, you may believe that I am he.*" The idea of the happiness of the disciples, who walk in the path of humility, calls forth in the heart of Jesus the feeling of a contrast; there is present a person who, indomitable in his pride, deprives himself of this happiness, and draws upon himself the opposite of the μακαρίτης (ver. 17). Ἐξελεξάμην, *I have chosen*, is referred by *Reuss* to the election to salvation; in this sense the term would not be applicable to Judas. This would be a new proof of the predestinationism of John. But nothing more, on the contrary, appears in all these narratives than human responsibility and culpability. Am I mistaken in surmising that the reading τίνας (*whom*) relating to the character has, in the Alexandrian authorities, been substituted for the οὓς (*those whom*) of the T. R. under the influence of this false interpretation? The election of which Jesus speaks refers to that of the Twelve, inclusive of Judas; comp. vi. 70. And to *know* signifies to *discern*, not, to approve, to love. The words: *I know*, serve to justify the preceding declaration: *I do not say this of you all*. If the *for* of 4 Mjj. is a gloss, it is a proper gloss. The *in order that* might be made to depend on the following verb *has lifted*: "In order that the Scripture might be fulfilled, he who eats has lifted." Jesus would thus insert the Scripture citation in His own discourse. But it is more natural to suppose an ellipsis, by explaining, with *Meyer*: "I have nevertheless chosen him in order that," or, what seems more simple, by supplying "*This has happened*, in order that," comp. xix. 36; 1 John ii. 19; *Matt. xxvi. 56*. This last ellipsis more expressly carries back the responsibility of the choice of Judas to God, whom Jesus has obeyed, see on vi. 64. Ps. xli., from the tenth verse of which the quoted passage is borrowed, is only indirectly Messianic; its immediate subject is the afflicted righteous person; but this idea is perfectly realized only in the suffering Messiah. Among the afflictions by which the righteous person is smitten, the Psalmist (*David*, according to the title; according to *Hitzig*, *Jeremiah*) puts in the first place the treachery of an intimate

<sup>1</sup> N A K Π 30 Mnn. It<sup>114</sup> Cop. Syr. read γαρ after εγω.

<sup>2</sup> N B C L M Orig. read τίνας (*whom*), instead of οὓς (*those whom*).

<sup>3</sup> B C L: μου (*my bread*), instead of μετ' εμου (*bread with me*).

<sup>4</sup> N A U II: επηκεν, instead of επηρεν.

friend. In the mouth of David, this feature has reference to Ahithophel. "This last stroke," Jesus means to say, "cannot fail to reach me also, in whom all the trials of the suffering righteous are united." Such, in this context, is the sense of the formula: *in order that it might be fulfilled*. Weiss claims that John wishes to put these words of the Psalm into the mouth of the Messiah Himself. Not a word in John's text justifies this assertion. If we compare xviii. 9 with xvii. 12 it will suffice to make us see how contrary it is to the evangelist's thought thus to press the idea of: *in order that it might be fulfilled*. Instead of the singular ἄρτον, *bread*, in conformity with the Hebrew, the LXX. have the plural ἄρτους, and, for all the rest of the passage, the translation of John is equally independent of that of the LXX.<sup>1</sup> *To lift up the heel*, in order to strike, is the emblem of brutal hatred, and not, as some have thought, of cunning. This expression is applied indeed to the present state of Judas, who has already prepared his treachery and is on the point of carrying it into execution. One may hesitate between the perfect ἐπῆρκεν and the aorist ἐπῆρεν. It is also difficult to decide between the two readings ἐμοῦ, *of me* and μετ' ἐμοῦ, *with me*; the first may have been derived from the LXX.; the second, from the parallel passages, Mark xiv. 18; Luke xxii. 21 (*Weiss*). Thus foreseen and foretold by Jesus, this treachery, which otherwise might have been a cause of stumbling to His disciples, will afterwards be transformed into a support for their faith. This is what Jesus desires to bring out in ver. 19, and not, as *Weiss* thinks, to set forth the proof of His Messiahship which will result from the fulfillment of the prophecy; comp. the words: *before it comes to pass*, which, in this case, would lose their force. The ἀπ' ἀπτι is opposed, not to the similar declarations which are still to follow respecting Judas (*Weiss*), but to the subsequent realization of the fact predicted.

Ver. 20. "*Verily, verily, I say unto you: He that receives him whom I shall send, receives me, and he that receives me, receives him that sent me.*" The relation between this saying and those which precede is so far from clear that *Kuinoel* and *Lücke* proposed to consider this verse as a gloss derived from Matt. x. 40. *Meyer* and *Hengstenberg* think that, in the presence of the treachery of Judas, Jesus wished to encourage His apostles by reminding them of the greatness of their mission. *Bäumlein* says: "A fragment from a larger whole, to which perhaps the institution of the Holy Supper belonged." *Luthardt* and *Keil* place this saying in connection with the washing of the feet; the disciples must learn from Jesus to render the same service to those whom He shall send to them. But, as we have seen, the meaning of the act of washing was altogether different, and this saying is too far separated from that act. Vv. 18, 19, are a simple digression occasioned by the contrast between the fate of Judas and the happiness of the faithful disciples (ver. 17). Ver. 20 is immediately connected with the idea of this happiness declared in vv. 16, 17. The one sent by Jesus, humble and faithful, who serves like Him, bears with him his Master, and, in His Master, God Himself. Jesus had just said: "*The*

<sup>1</sup> The LXX.: ἐμεγαλυε ἐπ' ἐμε περιρισμον,

*servant is not greater than the Master;*" He now seems to say: "And he is not less great than He." To receive him is, consequently, to receive in him Jesus, and in Jesus God Himself; comp. Matt. xviii. 4, 5, and the parallels. In Luke xxii. 29, 30, Jesus, after having said: "Behold, I am among you as he that serves," adds: "*I give you the kingdom as my Father has given it to me.*" To give the kingdom, in its true spiritual form—is it not to bear God in oneself and communicate Him to the one who receives you? This saying, therefore, accords perfectly, as to its meaning, with our ver. 20.

*Bretschneider* and *Strauss* regarded this story of the washing of the feet as a legendary creation which emanated from the consciousness of the Church. But, as *Baur* observed with respect to the resurrection of Lazarus, if such a fictitious story had been the product of the Christian consciousness and had been circulated in the Church, it could not have failed to appear also in the Synoptics. *Baur* therefore regards this incident as consciously invented by the evangelist to serve the moral idea. But it is difficult to explain in this way the production of so simple and life-like a scene, and especially the composition of the inimitable conversation between Jesus and Peter. Even *Schweizer* has admirably brought out the stamp of historical truthfulness impressed upon this whole story. *Keim* thinks that Jesus would not on this evening have come so directly into collision with the feeling of the disciples. But it was a matter of inculcating upon them ineffaceably the spirit of His work and of their future mission; and this was the last moment for doing this. The omission of this incident in the Synoptics is made an objection. Probably the institution of the Lord's Supper, that fact of capital importance for the Church, eclipsed this one in the oral tradition relative to this last meal. *Hilgenfeld* surmises that the evangelist meant to substitute this narrative, imagined by him, for that of the institution of the Lord's Supper which he designedly omitted (*Evngl.*, p. 711), as too distinctly recalling the Jewish Paschal supper. But what result could be attained by this means in the second century, when the Lord's Supper was celebrated throughout the whole Church, unless that of rendering his Gospel liable to suspicion? The discourse directed against false greatness, which is added by Luke to the narrative of the supper, naturally implies a fact of this kind. There was nothing to prevent the author from placing the two stories in juxtaposition. The better known story would have confirmed the one which was less known. It is very evident that John desired to rescue from oblivion what the tradition had neglected, and that he omitted what was sufficiently well known and what had no particular connection with the principal aim of his work.

## II.—*The dismissal of Judas: vv. 21–30.*

Here also is a work of Jesus' love towards His own. As long as Judas was present, His heart was under restraint, and could not give vent to all the feelings of which He was full. Ver. 31 expresses in a life-like way the feeling of deliverance which Jesus Himself experiences on seeing the traitor withdraw; and it is at this moment that that rich outpouring begins which fills chaps. xiv.–xvii. These final moments of intimate association were indispensable to the Lord's work.

Judas had represented, in the circle of the Twelve, the spirit of carnal Messianism, directly opposed to that which Jesus had just vindicated by the act of washing the feet; comp. vi. 64, 70. If he was unwilling to renounce this spirit and humble himself, he must depart; it was the spirit of the false Messiah, of the Jewish Messiah, of the Antichrist that departed with him.

Vv. 21, 22. "*After having said this, Jesus was troubled in his spirit and testified and said, Verily, verily, I say unto you that one of you shall betray me. 22. The disciples therefore<sup>1</sup> looked upon one another, not being able to understand of whom he was speaking.*" Jesus' emotion does not spring from any personal impression, like the fear of death, the grief of wounded affection or pity for the traitor; there would, in that case, be the word *ψυχή*, *soul*, as in xii. 27. The limiting word *τῷ πνεύματι*, *in his spirit*, shows that this emotion has its seat in a higher region than that of the natural sensibility, even though the noblest. It is, as in xi. 33, 38, a shock of a religious nature, a kind of horror which His pure heart feels at the contact with the instrument of this Satanic crime and the approach of its invisible author. On this difference between *ψυχή*, *the soul*, and *πνεῦμα*, *the spirit*, see on xii. 27. The words: *having said this*, connect this emotion closely with the preceding words, in which Jesus had twice alluded to the treachery of Judas; the term: *he testified* contrasts the positive declaration which is to follow with the vague indications of vv. 10, 18. The *amen, amen*, marks the divine certainty of the declaration in face of the difficulty in receiving it, which must have existed for the apostles. But the apostles (ver. 22) doubt rather respecting themselves and their own hearts, than respecting the Master's word. "*Is it I?*" they, each of them ask, with a humble docility. The Synoptics say the same thing. According to Matt. xxvi. 25, Judas himself also addresses this question to Jesus. This fact has been thought incredible. But to be the only one to keep silence, when all ask such a question, would not this have been to betray oneself? As to the reply of Jesus: "*Thou hast said,*" in Matt. xxvi. 25, it is in reality only the summary of the following scene in the narrative of John; it is by the act related here, ver. 26, that Jesus made this reply to him.

Vv. 23, 24. *Now<sup>2</sup> one of the<sup>3</sup> disciples, he whom Jesus loved, was reclining on his bosom; 24 Simon Peter beckoned to him to ask who this one might be.<sup>4</sup>* Among the ancients, persons reclined rather than sat at table, each guest having the left arm supported on a cushion, so as to support the head, and the right arm free, for eating; the feet were extended behind. Each guest thus had his head near the breast of the one whose place was at his left hand; this was John's place as related to Jesus, at this last meal. The unanimous tradition of the primitive Church designates John as the dis-

<sup>1</sup> B C omit οὐν.

<sup>2</sup> B C L omit δε.

<sup>3</sup> 11 Mjj. (N A B C etc.) add εκ before τῶν μαθητῶν.

<sup>4</sup> Instead of πυθεσθαι τις αν ειη (to inquire who it was) which is read by T. R. with 14 Mjj. (A D Γ Δ Α Η etc.) most of the Mun. Syr.

Corp., και λεγει αυτω ειπε τις εστιν (and he says to him: tell us who it is) is read in B C I L X Italicque Vulg. Orig. N unites the two readings: πυθεσθαι τις αν ειη περι ου ελεγεν και λεγει αυτω ειπε τις εστιν (to inquire who was the one of whom he spoke, and he says to him: tell who it is).

ciple to whom ver. 23 applies. Our Gospel itself allows no doubt of this; as we have shown in the Introduction (Vol. I., p. 32 f.). This appears from xxi. 2, compared with vv. 7 and 20-23 of the same chapter. Among the seven disciples who are named in ver. 2, Peter, Thomas, and Nathanael are of course excluded, since the disciple whom Jesus loved is nowhere designated by his name in the Gospel, while these three are thus designated several times. The last two disciples, who are not named, do not seem to have belonged to the circle of the apostles; there remain, therefore, only the two sons of Zebedee. As James is excluded by the fact of his early death (comp. what is said of the disciple whom Jesus loved, ver. 22: "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is it to thee?"), John only remains. The Synoptic narrative leads to the same result: The disciple whom Jesus loved being necessarily one of the three privileged apostles, and Peter and James being excluded for the reasons indicated, John alone remains. If he designates himself by this periphrase, it is certainly not through vanity as has been asserted—it is precisely from humility that he avoids declaring his name, but with the feeling of the infinite condescension of Him who had deigned to treat him, during His earthly existence, as *His friend*. The reading of the T. R., agreeing with 14 MSS., among which are the *Alexandrian* and *Cambridge* MSS., and with the *Peschito*, is very simple: "Simon Peter beckons to him to ask who it is of whom he speaks." But the Alexandrian authorities, the *Vatican* and *Ephrem* MSS., etc., and the *Itala* read: "Simon Peter beckons to him and says to him: Tell who it is of whom he speaks." The *Sinaitic* MS. unites the two readings and puts them in juxtaposition, a fact which, in any case, proves the high antiquity of both. Against the first is alleged its great clearness and simplicity; this can be a reason for rejecting it only if the second presents a really admissible meaning. Otherwise the latter must be regarded as the result of an accidental error or of a faulty correction. The attempt has been made to give it two meanings. *Ewald*: "He makes a sign and says: Tell (to Jesus) who is the one of whom he speaks." But, in this case, either: of whom *thou speakest*, or: *ask him*, instead of *tell* would be necessary. The majority (*Weiss, Keil, Luthardt*) think that Peter, supposing that John already knows from Jesus who is the traitor, simply says to *John*: "Tell me who it is of whom he (Jesus) speaks." But the: *he beckons*, implies that Peter and John were not seated near one another, while the: *he says to him*, would imply proximity. To solve this contradiction, these last words must, in this case, be explained: "he says to him *by a sign*" (*ῥῆμα ἰσχυρῶς*). Is this use of *ἰσχυρῶς* natural? But, above all, how could Peter have supposed so positively and mistakenly (ver. 25) that John already knew this secret? For myself, I persist in believing that in this case, as in so many others, it is an error to bind oneself to the Alexandrian text. The reading of this text seems to me to result from a gloss, sometimes *added to* (*Sinait.*), sometimes *substituted for* (*Vatican*), the primitive text which has been preserved in the other documents. It follows from ver. 24 that Peter was not seated at Jesus' side; otherwise he might have himself put the question to Him.

Vv. 25-27a. "He<sup>1</sup> therefore<sup>2</sup> leaning back<sup>3</sup> on Jesus' breast, says to him, Lord, who is it? 26. Jesus answers him: He it is to whom I shall give a piece of bread when it is dipped.<sup>4</sup> And having dipped<sup>5</sup> the piece,<sup>6</sup> he gave it to Judas Iscariot, son of Simon.<sup>7</sup> 27a. And, after he had taken the piece, then<sup>8</sup> Satan entered into him." The received reading *ἐπιπεσών* (which is found in the *Sinaitic*, and *Alexandrian* MSS., etc.), *leaning*, strictly *throwing himself*, indicates a sudden movement, in harmony with the liveliness of the feeling which produces it. It is perfectly suitable, provided we do not add *οὕτως*, *thus*, as *Tischendorf* and *Meyer* do, which is wholly without meaning. The *οὕτως* can only be maintained with the reading *ἀναπεσών*: "seated at table as he was;" it would be an allusion to ver. 23: *on the breast of Jesus*, so *Bäumlein*. But the reading *ἀναπεσών* may easily have arisen from xxi. 20 and the adverb *οὕτως* may have been added to complete this participle, which could only be a repetition of ver. 23. In the course of the Paschal meal, the father of the family offered to the guests pieces of bread or meat which he dipped in a broth composed of fruits boiled in wine; these fruits represented the blessings of the Promised Land. And even outside of this special meal it is customary in the East, it seems, for the host to offer the guest whom he wishes to honor a piece of meat (see *Westcott*). Jesus, connecting Himself with this custom, answers John in this form which was naturally intelligible only to him. As a sign of communion, it was a last appeal to the conscience of Judas. If, in receiving it, his heart had broken, He could still have obtained pardon. This moment was therefore decisive; and it is this that John makes manifest by the *τότε*, *then* (ver. 27), a word of tragic weight. The Alexandrian reading adds, after the words: "*having dipped the morsel*," the following: *he takes it and*, which could only mean: "he takes it *from the dish*;" a very idle meaning. "Until this time," says *Hengstenberg*, "Judas had stifled in himself, in the interest of his passion, the conviction of the divinity of Jesus. Now the ray of divine omniscience<sup>9</sup> which had, in the preceding warnings (vv. 10, 18) only grazed the surface, penetrates him. Jesus says to him plainly by this sign and by the words which accompany it (Matt. xxvi. 25, "*Thou hast said*"): Thou art the one who eats my bread and yet betrays me! But He also gives him to understand that he is still of the number of His own. He might therefore return backward. But he would not; and the violent effort which he was obliged to make in order to close

<sup>1</sup> K S U Γ A read *οὗτος* instead of *εκείνος*.

<sup>2</sup> N D L M X Δ some Mnn. *Ἰπτερίσκη* Vulg. read *οὖν* instead of *δέ*, which T. R. reads with 7 Mjj. Mnn. *Ἰπτερίσκη*. B. C. omit the particle altogether.

<sup>3</sup> B C K L X Π 20 Mnn. Orig. read *ἀναπεσών* instead of *ἐπιπεσών*. 10 Mjj. read *οὕτως* (*thus*) after *ἐπι-* (or *ἀνα-*) *πεσών*; this word is omitted in the T. R. with N A D Π.

<sup>4</sup> B C L: *βαψω το ψωμ. και δωσω*. T. R. with the rest: *βαψας το ψωμ. επιδωσω*.

<sup>5</sup> B C L X Orig.: *βαψας οὖν*. T. R., with the rest: *και εμβαψας*.

<sup>6</sup> B C L M Orig. add *λαμβάνει και* after *ψωμιον* (*he takes it and*).

<sup>7</sup> The Alex. (N B C etc.): *Ἰσκαριωτου*. T. R. with the rest (A Γ Δ etc.). *Ἰσκαριωτη*.

<sup>8</sup> N D L *Ἰπτερίσκη* omit *τοτε* (*then*).

<sup>9</sup> I have not intended, in quoting this fine passage, to make all its expressions my own, as *Weiss* supposes; there is in it what passes beyond my way of understanding the supernatural knowledge of Jesus (see on iv. 17 ff.). I do not even think that there was occasion here to speak of faith in the divinity of Jesus.

his heart against the heavenly powers opened its doors to the diabolical powers. It is even from these last that he must seek the strength to accomplish this final act of resistance. As it is said of David; "*He strengthened himself in God*, so Judas strengthened himself in Satan." The dwelling of Satan in a soul has its degrees, as well as that of the Holy Spirit. Luke (xxii. 3) has united the phases which John distinguishes (comp. ver. 2). The present moment is that in which the will of Judas was finally confiscated by the power to which he had gradually surrendered himself. Until then he had acted freely and as if by way of experiment; he had played with the enemy. From this moment it will be impossible for him to draw back; it will be the enemy who will play with him. It has been asserted that John ascribes this result to a magical action of the morsel of bread, and that there was here, according to him, a miracle by means of which Jesus "*demonized the soul of the disciple.*"<sup>1</sup> If John had wished to express such an idea he would have written, not *μετὰ τὸ ψωμίον*, after the morsel, but *μετὰ τοῦ ψωμίον*, with the morsel. It is also asked: Who then saw Satan enter into Judas?<sup>2</sup> Perhaps, John himself, we will answer. The terrible conflict which was carried on within him at this moment could not remain unnoticed by the eyes of him who anxiously observed the traitor, and something infernal in the expression of his features bore testimony of the decisive victory which the devil had just gained in his heart. *Weiss* and *Keil* are willing to admit here only a pure "psychological assurance." But such an assurance has as its basis either some perception or a revelation. Would these interpreters then adopt this second alternative? *Keim* has judged the conduct of Jesus at this moment with severity, in case John has exactly described it; it would even, up to a certain point, excuse Judas.<sup>3</sup> But Jesus carefully spared the traitor, in making him known to no one but John only.

Vv. 27b-30. "*Jesus therefore said to him: What thou doest, do quickly. 28. But no one of those who were at table knew why he said this to him. 29. For some thought that, as Judas had the bag, Jesus meant to say to him, Buy the things which we have need of for the feast, or that he bade him give something to the poor. 30. He therefore, having taken the morsel, went out immediately. Now it was night.*" The words of Jesus to Judas are not a permission (*Grotius*); they are a command. But, it is said, Jesus pushed Judas into the abyss by speaking to him thus. Jesus had no longer any ground to spare him, since from this decisive moment no return was possible for Judas. The evening was already far advanced (ver. 30), and Jesus had need of the little time which remained to Him to finish His work with His own. Judas in his pride imagined that he held the person of his Master in his hands. Jesus makes him understand that he, as well as the new master whom he obeys, is only an instrument. The word *τάχιον* signifies: *more quickly*; the meaning is therefore: "*hasten thy begun work.*" John says: *no one of those who were at table* (ver. 28). Perhaps he

<sup>1</sup> *Revue de théol.*, 3d series., I., p. 255.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> "*Freilich wenn Jesus ihn so prostituirte,*

*wie bei Johannes, war Judas einigermassen entschuldigt.*" iii., p. 262.

tacitly excepts himself. *Weiss* thinks not. He believes also that John did not understand the import of the injunction of Jesus. From the words: *for the feast*, some infer that this evening could not be that on which the people celebrated the Paschal supper. For how could purchases be made on a Sabbatical day, such as that was? And if the Paschal supper, the essential act of the feast, was already finished, there were no more purchases to be made *for the feast*. But, on the other side, it may be said that if this evening had been that of the 13th-14th of Nisan, the entire day of the 14th would still remain for making purchases. And how could the disciples have supposed that Jesus sent Judas out for this purpose in the darkness of the night (*Luthardt, Keil*)? This passage, therefore, does not seem to us fitted to solve the difficult question which is in hand. Nevertheless it appears to me that the *for the feast* is more naturally understood if it was yet on the evening which preceded the day of the 14th, the first of the feast of the Passover (see on ver. 1). We are amazed at the skill with which Judas had been able to disguise his character and his plans. Even at this last moment, his fellow-disciples were entirely blinded with regard to him. On His part, Jesus could not without danger unmask him more openly than He does here; with the impetuosity of a Peter, what might have occurred between him and the traitor? This whole scene, described in vv. 27-29, was an affair of a moment. For this reason the words: *having taken the morsel*, ver. 30, are directly connected by *ὃν* with ver. 27: *and after having taken the morsel*. It is between the participle *having taken* and the verb *he went out*, that *Heugstenberg* wishes to place the institution of the Lord's Supper. But the *εὐθέως*, *immediately*, too closely connects the second of these two acts with the first. The last words: *it was night*, make us think of Jesus' words in Luke xxii. 53: "This is your hour and the power of darkness." They complete the picture of a situation which had left on the heart of John ineffaceable recollections. The Johannean narrative is studded throughout with similar incidents, which are explicable only by the vividness of personal recollection. Comp. i. 40, vi. 59, viii. 20, x. 23, etc. *Augustine* (see *Westcott*) adds to these words: *Erat autem nox*, this gloss: *Et ipse qui exivit erat nox*.

At what time in the meal is the institution of the Lord's Supper to be placed? We adopt the view, as we propose this question, that this meal is in fact the one in which, according to the Synoptics, Jesus instituted this ceremony. *Bengel*, *Wichelhaus* and others, it is true, have tried to distinguish two suppers: the first, that of John xiii., took place at Bethany; xiv. 31 indicates the moment when Jesus departed from that place to repair to Jerusalem; the second, that of the Synoptics, took place on the next day at evening, at the time of the Israelite Paschal supper. But the prediction of the denial of Peter, with the words: *Even this night*, in both passages, renders this supposition inadmissible. We hold, moreover, that, if the author of the fourth Gospel does not mention the institution of the Lord's Supper, it is not because he is ignorant of it or that he would deny it, but because this fact was sufficiently well known in the Church, and because there was nothing to lead him specially to recall it to mind in his narrative (see on ver. 20).

If the case stands thus, where is the institution of the Lord's Supper to be inserted in our narrative? According to *Kern*, after xiv. 31, as the foundation of the discourse in xv. 1 ff.: "*I am the true vine*," etc. But, at this time, Jesus rises and gives the order to depart: is this a suitable situation for such a ceremony? According to *Olshausen*, *Luthardt*, after xiii. 38 (prediction of Peter's denial) and before the words: *Let not your heart be troubled*. This opinion would be admissible, if the Synoptics did not agree in placing the prediction of the denial *after* the institution, and even (two of them) on the way to Gethsemane. *Lücke*, *Lange*, *Maier* and others: in the interval between ver. 33 and ver. 34, because of the connection between the idea of the *new commandment* and that of the *new covenant* in the institution of the Supper. But the direct connection between the question of Peter: *Lord, whither goest thou?* (ver. 36) and the words of Jesus: *Whither I go, ye cannot come* (ver. 33), make it difficult to insert so considerable a ceremony between these two verses. *Neander*, *Ebrard*: in the interval between ver. 32 and ver. 33. There is, indeed, between vv. 31, 32 and vv. 33, 34 a certain break of continuity. The idea of the glory of Jesus (vv. 31, 32) may have *preceded* the institution of the Supper, and the latter have been followed no less naturally by the idea of the approaching departure of Jesus (vv. 33, 34). In itself, there is nothing to oppose this solution. *Paulus*, *Kahn* and others decide for the interval between ver. 30 and ver. 31, immediately after the departure of Judas. The words: *When therefore he was gone out, Jesus said* (see at ver. 31) are not favorable to this opinion, and the words of vv. 31 and 32 have the character of an exclamation called forth by the departure of Judas. *Meyer*, *Weiss*, *Keil* (the last two, because of the first two Synoptics, who place the institution of the Supper immediately after the revelation concerning the traitor) content themselves with saying: after ver. 30, without attempting to make a more precise statement. But what, in this case, are we to do with the narrative of Luke who, on the contrary, places the revelation of the traitor immediately after the institution of the Supper. If he works on the foundation of Mark's narrative, how does he modify it in so perceptible and arbitrary a manner? And if he has a source which is peculiar to himself, why should it not have its own value by the side of that of the two other Synoptics? His account of the institution of the Supper is fully confirmed by Paul. The opinion of these critics is, therefore, precarious. The idea of *Heugstenberg* (at the moment of ver. 30 and before the departure of Judas) is not compatible with the expression: *he went out immediately*. *Stier* has decided for the interval between ver. 22 and ver. 23; but the question of Peter in ver. 24 is so closely connected with that of the disciples in ver. 22! *Bäumlein* suggests the interval between ver. 19 and ver. 21, where the quite isolated words of ver. 20 are placed. The idea of receiving Jesus in the person of His messengers, and of receiving in Him God Himself, is indeed in harmony with that of the dwelling of the Lord in His own; thus with that of the Supper.

In my first edition, the authority of Luke's narrative and certain indications in that of John led me to place the washing of the feet quite at the end of the meal. The institution of the Lord's Supper must consequently have preceded it, and thus I went back, with *Seiffert*,<sup>1</sup> even to the beginning of the meal, vv. 1-3, for the locating of the Supper, while seeking an allusion to this last pledge of the divine love in the expression: *He ended by testifying to them all his love*. I have abandoned

<sup>1</sup> *Ueber den Ursprung des ersten canonischen Evangeliums.*

this idea altogether: 1. Because there is an improbability in placing the washing of the feet at the end of the meal; 2. Because ver. 26 (the morsel given to Judas) proves that they were still in the midst of the meal, after that act; 3. Because the indication, Luke xxiii. 24, is very vague: "*There was also a dispute among the disciples.*" It is impossible to draw from this a conclusion with relation to the moment when the dispute occurred.

*Beyschlag* has brought out an important circumstance; it is that according to the Synoptics the institution of the Supper did not take place at one single time, but that it was divided into two very distinct acts; the one *during*, the other *after* the meal (Luke xxii. 20 and 1 Cor. xi. 25). The first may, therefore, be placed before ver. 18, and the second after ver. 30. *Westcott* arrives at nearly the same result. He places the act relating to the bread between 19 and 20 and that relating to the cup between 32 and 33. If we study the Synoptic narratives, we find in all the three these three elements: 1. The farewell word (*I will no more drink of this fruit of the vine*); 2. The institution of the Supper; 3. The revelation of the traitor. In the three accounts, the second is placed in the middle; but the first is placed as the third in Luke, at the beginning in the other two, from which it follows that the question of the participation of Judas in the Supper is not so simple as it appears to be at the first glance, and may be resolved at once affirmatively (with relation to the bread) and negatively (with relation to the cup). A second observation which goes to support the preceding is that, according to John, Jesus spoke of Judas not once, but three times, at different moments in the repast. The Synoptics have concentrated these three revelations in a single one, which they have placed, either before, or after, the institution of the Supper. It is very possible, therefore, that the two forms of the Synoptic story respecting this point are not exclusive of each other, and that we may be led to represent the matter to ourselves in this way: First, the word of farewell: This is my last meal (Luke); then, a word relating to the betrayal (Matthew and Mark); then, the institution of the Supper, so far as the bread was concerned (the three); a new word relating to Judas (Luke); finally, his going out and the institution of the cup.

With reference to the conduct of Judas, I will add some considerations to those which were presented at the end of chap. vi. This man had attached himself to Jesus, not for the satisfaction of his moral needs, as one *drawn, taught and given* by God (vi. 39, 44, 45), but by political ambition and gross cupidity. For he hoped for a brilliant career in following Him whom so many miracles proved to be the Christ. But when he perceived that the path followed by Jesus was the opposite of that which he had hoped, he was continually more and more irritated and embittered from day to day. He saw himself at once deceived on the side of Jesus and compromised by his character as a disciple before the rulers of the hierarchy. His treachery was therefore the result at once of his resentment against Jesus, by whom he believed himself to be deceived, and of his desire to restore himself to favor with the great men of the nation. As soon as he realized that this last purpose failed, despair took possession of him. Judas is the example of a faith and repentance which do not have as their origin moral needs.

It is important to notice finally *the relation between the narrative of John and that of the Synoptics* to the subject of this whole scene. What strikes us is that in the Synoptics the relation between Jesus and Judas in this meal is presented as a particular story, forming in itself a whole, while in John the setting forth of the matter is gradual, varied and in a manner blended with the narrative of the whole of

the repast in a life-like way. How can we fail to understand the historical superiority of this second form? Does not *Beyschlag* rightly say: "By the dramatic clearness of John's narrative the obscurities of the Synoptic story are scattered"?

## SECOND SECTION.

### XIII. 31—XVI. 33.

#### THE DISCOURSES.

Jesus has just taken leave of Judas, an eternal leavetaking: *Do what thou hast to do!* He turns now towards His own, and the farewell which He addresses to them is an: until we meet again (*Gess*).<sup>1</sup> The departure of Judas has restored to His restrained feeling all its freedom. He can henceforth, during the short time which remains to Him, pour forth His feelings, partly in conversations called out by their questions, partly in teachings which come spontaneously from His heart and which end by revealing to His disciples what He is for them. Softened as they are by the love of which He has just borne witness, humbled as they have never been, even by His humility, the apostles are now well prepared to receive and to appropriate to themselves His last revelations.

A series of short dialogues (comp. the questions of Peter, Thomas, Philip and Judas) opens these communications of an entirely familiar character. The subject of these conversations is naturally the approaching separation, with regard to which Jesus seeks to reassure them (chap. xiv). Ver. 31 of this chapter, by the external fact which is indicated in it, separates these conversations from the following discourses. In the latter, Jesus transports Himself in thought to the period when His disciples will have to continue His work and to labor in His name for the salvation of the world, and He promises them His aid in view of this task. It is the idea of His spiritual union with them which forms the basis of these teachings (xv. 1—xvi. 15). Finally, the thought returns to its starting-point, the impending separation. The dialogue-form reappears and Jesus then finds the decisive words which inspire them with the strength of which they have need at this sorrowful moment: xvi. 16—33. Thus a dying father, after having gathered his family about him, begins by speaking to them of his end; then, their future career opens itself before his eyes: he shows them what they will have to do here on earth and what the earth will be to them. After which, returning to the present situation, he draws from the depths of his paternal heart a last word which alleviates the final farewell.

This progress is so natural that we are obliged to say that, if this situation existed and if Jesus spoke at this moment, He must have spoken in this way. The discourse is constantly elevated, simple, tender, on the level of the situation; there reigns in it a deep but repressed emotion. The logical connection is not for an instant broken, but it is never made

<sup>1</sup> See his excellent work: *Bibelstunden über Ev. Johannis*, C. XIII.—XVII. 2<sup>o</sup> Aufl., 1873.

conspicuous. Distinctness of intuition is united with inwardness of feeling, and we yield ourselves easily to the gentle undulation of the thought which results from the movement of the heart. We know of only two passages in our sacred books which offer any analogy to this one, and both of them owe their origin to analogous situations. They are the last discourses of Moses, in Deuteronomy, where the legislator takes leave of his people, and the second part of Isaiah, where the prophet, transporting himself in spirit beyond the future ruin and rising again of Israel, describes its work in the midst of the world.—*Hilgenfeld* establishes an opposition between these discourses and the last teachings, of an eschatological character, which the Synoptics have handed down to us (Matt. xxiv., Mark xiii.). The evangelist with his lofty spiritualism substituted, according to his view, for the visible return at the Parousia the spiritual coming of Jesus. But the notion of the coming and work of the Spirit is by no means wanting in the Synoptics; it is at the foundation of the parables of the talents and the pounds, in Matthew and Luke; of that of the virgins, in Matthew; comp. also the promises Matt. xxviii. 19–20; Luke xxiv. 48, 49, etc. And, on the other hand, the idea of the outward and visible consummation is not wanting in John, as we have seen (v. 28, 29, vi. 39, 40, 44, 54, xii. 48; comp. 1 Ep. ii. 28). The kingdom of the Spirit and the selection which results from it, to the view of John, only prepare for the kingdom of Christ and the final judgment.

I.—*The separation; its necessity: xiii. 31–xiv. 31.*

After some words uttered by Jesus under the immediate impression of the departure of Judas (vv. 31–35), Jesus replies to different questions relative to His approaching removal which He has just announced to them; that of Peter (ver. 36–xiv. 4), that of Thomas (vv. 5–7); that of Philip (vv. 8–21), and that of Judas (vv. 22–24); He closes with some reflections with which the present situation inspires Him (vv. 25–31).

1. Vv. 31–35.

Vv. 31, 32. “*When therefore he was gone out, Jesus says, Now has the Son of man been glorified; and God has been glorified in him. 32. If God has been glorified in him,<sup>2</sup> God will also glorify him in himself,<sup>3</sup> and will straightway glorify him.*”—These two verses are as if a cry of relief which escapes from the heart of Jesus at the sight of the withdrawing traitor. Some documents reject *ὄν, therefore*, which would allow us, with many commentators, to connect the words *ὅτε ἐξῆλθεν* with the preceding clause: “It was night when he went out.” But this useless appendage would weaken the solemn gravity of the brief clause: “*Now it was night.*” And the verb *λέγει, he says*, would also come in too abruptly. *Ὅτε ὄν* must therefore be read:

<sup>1</sup> T. R. reads *οτε ουν* with **Σ B C D L X** some Mnn. It. Vulg. Cop. Orig., while **ς** rejects *ουν* with the other Mjj. 90 Mnn. Syr.

<sup>2</sup> **Σ B C D L X II 12** Mnn. It<sup>plurique</sup> omit the

words *ει ο θεος εδοξασθη εν αυτω*, which are read in T. R. with 12 Mjj. (A T Δ etc.) Mnn. It<sup>pl</sup> Vulg. Cop. Syr. Orig.

<sup>3</sup> **Σ B II Δ** read *εν αυτω* instead of *εν εαυτω*.

"When therefore he was gone out, Jesus says."—The *viv*, *now*, which begins the following words, puts them quite naturally in connection with the fact which has just taken place, the departure of Judas. *Hengstenberg*, *Weiss* and *Keil* do not believe in such a connection. This *now*, according to them, refers to the impending end of His earthly activity, the result of which Jesus contemplates with joy. This, as it seems to me, is to fail to recognize the connection of ideas which John himself wished to set forth by saying so expressly : "When he was gone out, He says."—The past tense *ἰδοξάσθη*, *is glorified*, sums up all the past life of Jesus, up to the scene which has just occurred, and which, in certain respects, is the crowning point of it. Empty human glory, which He had always rejected, has just been expressly declared to be excluded from His work and that of His apostles. The washing of their feet has condemned it ; it has just gone out with Judas, who was the stubborn representative of it among the disciples. The true glory, that which comes from God, that which consists in humility and charity, has been realized to the utmost in the person of Jesus ; it has just triumphed over the false glory. Some interpreters have referred this term *is glorified* to the *future glory* of Jesus, either through His death (*Meyer*), or through His exaltation to the right hand of God (*Luthardt*, *Gess*). But, in ver. 32, Jesus sets in opposition to this verb in the past tense the future *δοξάσει*, *will glorify*, to designate His glorification which is to come. Comp. also xvii. 10, where He declares Himself *already now* glorified (*ἰδοξασμαι*) in the hearts of the apostles.

We understand from this why He designates Himself as the *Son of man*. It is indeed by the humiliation with which He has placed Himself on the level with His brethren and made Himself their servant, that He has obtained this glory.—A glory which consists even in humility does not, like human glory, make him who possesses it a usurper of the glory of God. For this reason He is able to speak of it without scruple as He does here. Its essence is to give all glory to God, as He immediately adds : "*And God is glorified in him.*" In this glory of Jesus that of God Himself has shone forth. The perfection of the paternal character of God has been manifested fully in the person and work of the Son of man, ver. 32. But God cannot abandon him who has made himself the instrument of His glory. "He honors him who serves Him" (xii. 26).—The first words of ver. 32 : *If God is glorified in him*, are rejected by the Alexandrian authorities. But even Tischendorf condemns this omission. *Weiss* also : "One cannot set aside the suspicion that the omission of these words in the most ancient Codd. is the result of the confounding of the two *ἐν αὐτῷ*." *Westcott* and *Hort* retain them in spite of everything. The examples of such omissions in the Alexandrian text, however, are numerous, especially in the *Sinaitic MS.*—The clause : *If God is glorified in him*, fully explains the transition from the past tense *is glorified* to the future *will glorify*, ver. 32. The instrument of the glory of God on the earth, Jesus will be glorified by God in heaven. Could God do less than that which the Son of man has done for Him ? This correlation is expressed by the word *καί*, *also*, which is placed for this reason at the beginning of the clause ; comp. xvii. 4, 5. Whether we read

*ἐν αὐτῷ* with B. etc., or *ἐν ἑαυτῷ* with the T. R. and all the Mj. except four, the meaning is still : *in God*. The two limiting phrases : *in him* (Jesus), and *in him* or *in himself* (God), answer to each other. When God has been glorified in a person, He draws him to His bosom and envelops him *in His glory*. It is thus that the future of Jesus is illuminated to His view in the brightness of His past. And this future is near. The departure of Judas has just revealed to Him the fact of its imminence by announcing that of His death. *Soon*, says Jesus, alluding to His exaltation through the resurrection and ascension. The second *καὶ* is explanatory : "*and that soon*."—After having thus, under the influence of what has just occurred, given vent to His personal impressions, Jesus turns to His disciples and makes them the subject of His whole thought.

Vv. 33-35. "*My little children, yet a little while I am with you ; you will seek me, and, as I said to the Jews : Whither I go, you cannot come, so now I say to you. 34. I give you a new commandment, that you love one another ; as I have loved you, that you also love one another. 35. By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love one to another.*"<sup>2</sup>—The term of tenderness, *τεκνία*, *my little children*, is found nowhere else in our Gospels ; it is the *soon* of ver. 32, implying the near separation, which suggests it to Him. The disciples appear to Him as children whom He is about to leave as orphans on the earth. What a void in their life is that which will result from the disappearance of Jesus ! He Himself feels, in all its vividness, what they will experience. "*You will seek me ; you will wish to rejoin me.*" And for Himself, how desirous He must be to carry them away immediately with Himself into the divine world which He is about to enter again ! But what He had declared to the Jews six months before (vii. 34, viii. 21) is still for the moment applicable to the disciples : they are not ready to follow Him. Only there is this difference between them and the Jews, that for them this impossibility is merely temporary : comp. xiv. 3 : "*I will take you to myself, that where I am, there you may be also,*" while Jesus said to the Jews : "*You shall die in your sins.*" For the Jews the obstacle of the natural condemnation, which faith alone could have removed, will continue for ever by reason of their unbelief. As to the disciples, while waiting till they shall rejoin Him, He leaves to them a duty which will be at the same time their consolation ; the one which results from their new situation and which is indicated in ver. 34 : the duty of loving one another. It is by loving each other that they will supply the outward absence of Him who has loved them so tenderly.

The expression *ἐντολὴ καινὴ*, *new commandment*, has embarrassed the interpreters, because the Old Testament already commanded that one should love one's neighbor *as oneself* (Levit. xix. 18) and because it does not seem possible to love more than this. Or must we say, with Knapp, in his celebrated dissertation on this subject, and, as it seems, also with Reuss and Weiss, that Jesus, by His example and His word, teaches us to love our neighbor *more than ourselves* ? This thought is more specious than just. Or must we

<sup>1</sup> ⚭ L X I<sup>α</sup> and χρονον after μικρον.

<sup>2</sup> ⚭ reads μετ' ἀλλήλων instead of ἐν ἀλλήλοις.

give to the word *καὶ* here an extraordinary meaning, such as *illustrious* (Wolf), *ever new* (Olshausen), *renewed* (Calvin), *renewing the man* (Augustine), *unexpected* (Semler), *the last* (Heumann)? Nothing of all this is necessary. The entirely new character of Christian love results, in the first place, in an outward way from the *circle* in which it is exercised : *one another* ; this love applies not to all the human family in general, like the law of affection written on the conscience, nor, more specially, to members of the Israelite nation, like the commandment in Leviticus ; it embraces all those whom the common faith in Jesus and the love of which they are the object on His part unite. But the term *new* goes yet far deeper than this : it is a love new in its very *nature* : it starts from an altogether new centre of life and affection. The love of the Jew for the Jew arose from the fact that Jehovah was the God of both and had chosen them both in Abraham ; every Israelite became for every other, through this common blessing, like a second self. Jesus brought into the world and testified to His own a love specifically different from any love which had appeared until then, that which attaches itself to the human personality in order to save it. From this new hearth there springs forth the flame of an affection essentially different from any that the world knew under this name before. *In Christ* : this is the explanation of the word *new*. It is a family affection, and the family is born at this hour ; comp. 1 John ii. 8.—It is impossible for me to regard the words : *as I have loved you*, as Meyer, Luthardt, Weiss and Keil do, as depending on this first clause : *that you love one another*. The repetition of these last words at the end of the verse thus becomes useless. Jesus begins by saying : *that you love one another* ; then, taking up this command with a new emphasis, He adds to it, at this time, the characteristic definition : “I mean : that, *as I have loved you*, you should also love one another.” Comp. in xvii. 21 the same construction exactly. *καθὼς, as*, indicates more than a simple comparison (*ὡσπερ*) ; it designates a conformity. The love which unites believers among themselves is *of the same nature* as that which Jesus testifies to the believer (x. 15) ; each one, so to speak, loves his brother with the love with which Jesus loves both him and this brother.

To the obligation resulting from the words : *as I have loved you*, Jesus adds the loftiest motive, that of His glory. For him who has felt himself beloved by Him, there can be no motive more pressing.—*Ἐμοί* has perhaps more force as a dative than as a nominative plural : disciples belonging to me, the new Master. The history of the primitive Church realized this promise of Jesus : “They loved one another, even before knowing one another,” said Minutius Felix of the Christians ; and the scoffing Lucian said : “Their Master has made them believe that they are all brethren.”—Here begins a series of questions which were all raised in the hearts of the disciples by the thought of the threatened separation. The first is quite naturally this : Is there no means of avoiding this separation, even though temporary ? It is Peter, the boldest of all, who makes himself the organ of this desire, which is incompatible with the words of Jesus (ver. 33).

2. xiii. 36-xiv. 4.

Vv. 36-38. "*Simon Peter says to him, Lord, whither goest thou? Jesus answered him,<sup>1</sup> Whither I<sup>2</sup> go, thou canst not follow me now, but thou shalt follow me afterwards. 37. Peter says to him, Lord,<sup>3</sup> why cannot I follow thee now? <sup>4</sup> I will lay down my life for thee. 38. Jesus answered him,<sup>5</sup> Wilt thou lay down thy life for me? Verily, verily, I say unto thee, The cock shall not crow, till thou hast denied<sup>6</sup> me thrice.*"—What especially impressed St. Peter in the preceding words is the thought of ver. 33: "*Whither I go, you cannot come.*" Jesus is going to glory; Peter does not doubt this (ver. 32); why then, after having walked with Him on the waters and having ascended with Him the Mount of Transfiguration, can he not follow Him to glory, to return with Him soon to the earth, when he will establish His kingdom? Peter had merely said: *Whither goest thou?* but evidently, as a child who, when asking his father: *Whither art thou going?* means: *Cannot I go with thee?* Jesus understood the purpose of his question, and He replies to it by saying: *Thou canst not.* The temporary separation is inevitable; does Jesus think of the task which Peter will have still to accomplish here on earth by his apostolic ministry (*Weiss*)? Or must this word *can* be understood in a purely moral sense: "*Thou art not yet capable of making the sacrifice necessary for following me*" (*Tholuck*)? The words of xiv. 2, 3 cause us rather to think of reasons of another nature, at once objective and subjective. On the one hand, the redemption is not yet effected, and consequently the place of Peter is not yet prepared in heaven; on the other, Peter himself is not yet prepared for the place; the Holy Spirit has not yet made of him a new man. Peter, however, imagines that Jesus speaks thus only because He believes him incapable of facing death; and in the ardor of his zeal, exaggerating the measure of his moral strength, he declares himself ready to undergo martyrdom (ver. 37). Jesus, who knows him better than he knows himself, then declares to him that, even in this respect, he is still incapable of accompanying Him (ver. 38).—The cock-crowing of which Jesus speaks is that which properly bore this name; the second, that which precedes the break of day, about three o'clock in the morning (Mark xiii. 35). In the prediction of the denial in Mark (xiv. 30) allusion is also made to the first, the one at midnight.—The prediction of his denial seems to have produced on the apostle a very profound impression; he is, as it were, thunder-struck by it, and from this moment he does not speak any more until the end of these discourses.

xiv. 1, 2. "*Let not your heart be troubled. Believe in God; believe also in me. 2. In my Father's house there are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you;<sup>7</sup> I go to prepare a place for you.*"—The division of the chap-

<sup>1</sup> B C It<sup>erique</sup> Vulg. Cop. reject αυτω after απεκριθη.

<sup>2</sup> N D U add εγω before υπαγω.

<sup>3</sup> N some Mnn. Vulg. Cop. omit κυριε (Lord).

<sup>4</sup> C D L X read νυν instead of αρτι.

<sup>5</sup> N A B C L X: αποκριεται, instead of

απεκριθη αυτω.

<sup>6</sup> B D L X: αρνηση, instead of απαρνηση.

<sup>7</sup> N A B C E K L II 20 Mnn. It<sup>erique</sup> Vulg. Syr. Cop. read ουτι (that or because) before πορευομαι (I go to prepare for you).

ters here is very faulty ; for the following words are in close relation with the preceding conversation, and particularly with the words of Jesus : *Thou shalt follow me afterwards*. Extending this same promise to all the disciples (comp. ver. 33), Jesus explains to them in what way they will be able to rejoin Him. He is going away for the moment to prepare for them their place in heaven (ver. 2) ; then He will return to seek them in order to transport them thither (ver. 3). We must place ourselves at this particular point of view in order to thoroughly understand the exhortation to *confidence*, which ver. 1 contains. Very far from bringing trouble to their hearts, His departure should fill them with the sweetest hope. They should have confidence *in God*, who directs this work and does not leave their Master to perish through weakness, and *in Jesus* Himself, who executes the work on His part, and who, far from being separated from it by death, is going to continue and complete it above. I think, with most, that the two πιστεύετε, *believe*, are more in harmony with the imperative παραστέσω, *let it not be troubled*, if they are both taken as imperatives. Others take them both (*Luther*) as indicatives (*you believe*), or only the first (*Erasmus, Calvin, Grotius*), or only the second (*Olshausen*). Jesus would, in order to dispel their trouble, remind them of the faith which they already have in Him or in God or in both. This would be quite useless. In the second member, the limiting word *in me* is placed before the verb ; this is in order better to set forth the antithesis of the two limiting phrases *in God* and *in me* : “ Have confidence in God ; in me also have confidence.”

A first motive for confidence is given in ver. 2 ; it refers rather to confidence in God. Jesus points out to them that the house of the Father, to which He returns, is wide enough to receive them all and many others with them. The image is derived from those immense oriental palaces in which there is an apartment, not only for the sovereign and for the heir to the throne, but for all the king's sons, however numerous they may be. The term *πολλοί*, *many*, does not by any means refer to a *diversity* among these mansions (as if Jesus would allude to the different degrees of heavenly felicity), but only to their *number* : there are as many as there are believers ; each one will possess his own in this vast edifice.—This heavenly dwelling is above all the emblem of a spiritual state : that of communion with the Father, the filial position which is accorded to Christ in the divine glory, and in which He will give believers a share. But this state will be realized in a definite place, the place where God most illustriously manifests His presence and His glory—heaven. *Lange* thinks that when uttering these words Jesus pointed His disciples to the starry heaven ; but xiv. 31 proves that they were still in the room.—According to the Alexandrian reading, *ὅτι*, *that* or *because*, must be read after the words *I would have told you* : “ I would have told you *that* I go away,” or “ *because* I go away.” The first of these meanings is incompatible with ver. 3, where Jesus says precisely that He is going away and for the purpose of preparing. The Fathers who, in general, adopt this meaning, have not been successful in getting rid of the contradiction to that which follows, which it implies. *Weiss* and *Keil*, with their systematic preference for the Alexandrian authorities, try the

second meaning, *because* ; the former, by making this conjunction bear on the verb *I would have told*, but without being able to derive from it an intelligible thought ;<sup>1</sup> *Keil*, by referring the *because* to : *there are many mansions*, which forces us to make a parenthesis of the intermediate words : “There are many mansions . . . —if not . . . I would have told you—because I am going to prepare a place for you there.” But wherein is the stated proof : *I go to prepare*, more certain than the fact affirmed : *there is room* ? And this parenthesis, which is not indicated by anything, is unnatural. In this case again it must be acknowledged that the reading of the Alexandrian authorities is indefensible ; the *ὅτι* is an addition arising from the fact that it was desired to make the following words the contents of the verb *I would have said*. Some, whether rejecting or preserving the *ὅτι*, take the preceding words in the interrogative sense : “*Would I have said to you* (that I am going to prepare a place for you) ?” But He had nowhere said anything of this kind. Others translate : “*Would I say it to you* (at this moment) ?” But, in this case, the imperfect (*ἔλεγον ἂν*) would be necessary. We must, therefore, return to the simplest interpretation : “If it were not so, I would have told you.” That is to say : “If our separation were to be eternal, I would have forewarned you ; I would not have waited until this last moment to declare it to you ;” or, as *Grotius* says, *Ademissam vobis spem inanem*.

Their faith in God must make them understand that the Father’s house is spacious. But it is also needful that the *access* to it should be opened to them, and that they should have their dwelling there assured. Here it is that faith in Jesus intervenes, as the complement of faith in the Father. He is their *πρόδρομος*, their forerunner, to heaven (Heb. vi. 20). Under this image He causes them to view both His death, which, through reconciliation, will open for them the entrance to heaven, and His exaltation, by means of which there will be created in His person a glorious state in which He will afterwards give them a share. And the following is the way in which He will *prepare* it.

Vcr. 3. “*And if I shall have gone and*<sup>2</sup> *prepared*<sup>3</sup> *a place for you, I will come again and take you to myself, that where I am, there you may be also.*”—The place being once assured and prepared for them, they must be brought to reach it. It is He who will also charge Himself with this office. The rejection of *καί, and*, before *ἑτοιμάσω* in some MSS. (“and when I shall have gone, I will prepare”) would introduce an unnatural and even absurd *asyndeton* between the idea of *preparing* and that of *returning* which follows, and would at the same time lead to a complete tautology with the preceding sentence. The reading *ἑτοιμάσαι, to prepare*, is a further correction which was rendered almost indispensable by the rejection of the *καί*.—To the two verbs : “*when I shall have gone and shall have prepared,*” corre-

<sup>1</sup> Because He who goes away to prepare for them a place must know better than any one whether there are mansions there to be prepared. What a proof ! To prove His word by His knowledge and His knowledge by His

word !

<sup>2</sup> *Καί (and)* is omitted by Α Ε Γ Κ Γ Δ Λ 40 Mnn.

<sup>3</sup> D M 60 Mnn. Syr. : *ἑτοιμάσαι (to prepare for you)*, instead of *καί ἑτοιμάσω*.

spond the two verbs of the principal clause : *I will come again* (literally, *I come again*) and *I will take you to myself*. The present *I come again* indicates imminence. Notwithstanding this, *Origen* and other Fathers, *Calvin*, *Lampe*, and, among the moderns, *Hofmann*, *Luthardt*, *Meyer*, *Weiss*, and *Keil*, refer this term to the *final* and glorious *coming* of the Lord. Undoubtedly this promise is addressed to believers in general, but it has in view, nevertheless, first of all, the disciples personally, whom Jesus wishes to strengthen in their present disheartenment ; and He consoles them, it is said, by means of an event which no one of them has seen and which is still future at this hour ! In thus explaining the word *I come*, it is forgotten that Jesus never affirmed the nearness of His Parousia, and that, indeed, He rather gave an indication of the opposite : “ *As the bridegroom delays his coming*” (Matt. xxv. 5) ; “ *If the master comes in the second watch, or if he comes in the third*” (Luke xii. 38) ; “ *At evening or at midnight or at the cock-crowing or in the morning*” (Mark-xiii. 35) ; comp. also the parables of the leaven and the grain of mustard seed. Moreover, we have the authentic explanation of this word *come* in ver. 18, where, as *Weiss* acknowledges, it cannot be applied to the Parousia. *Ebrard* thinks that the point in question is the *resurrection* of Jesus. But the true reunion, after the separation caused by the death of Jesus, did not yet take place at the resurrection. The appearances of the Lord were transient ; their design was simply, through faith in the resurrection, to prepare for the coming of the Spirit. *Grotius*, *Reuss*, *Lange*, *Hengstenberg*, and *Keil* refer the word *come* to the return of Jesus at the *death* of each believer ; comp. the vision of Stephen. But in ver. 18 this sense is altogether impossible, and no example can be cited, not even xxi. 23, where it would lead to an intolerable tautology. This coming refers, therefore, as has been recognized by *Lücke*, *Olshausen*, *Neander*, to the return of Jesus through the Holy Spirit, to the close and indissoluble union formed thereby between the disciple and the glorified person of Jesus ; comp. all that follows in vv. 17, 19–21, 23 ; especially ver. 18, which is the explanation of our : *I come again*. *Weiss* alleges against our view that the question here is of a *personal* return. We defer this to ver. 18.—The following verb : *I will take you to myself*, indicates another fact, which will be the result of this spiritual preparation. This is the introduction of the believer into the Father’s house, at the end of his earthly career, either at the moment of his death, or at that of the Parousia, if he lives until that time. *Kai, and*, has the sense of *and consequently*, or of, *and afterwards*, as is indicated by the contrast between the present (*I come*) and the future (*I will take*). This will be the entrance of the believer, prepared by spiritual communion with Jesus, into the abode secured for him by the mediation of this same Jesus. *Πρὸς ἑμαυτόν, to myself* (xii. 32) ; He presses him to His heart, so to speak, while bearing him away. There is an infinite tenderness in these last words. It is for Himself that He seems to rejoice in and look to this moment which will put an end to all separation : “ *That where I am, there you may be also ;*” comp. xvii. 24. The community of *place*, (“ *there where*”) implies that of *state*. Otherwise the return of Jesus in spirit would not be necessary in

order to prepare in each particular case this reunion. What touching simplicity and what dramatic vivacity in the expression of these ideas, so profound and so new ! *The Father's house, the preparation of the dwelling-place, the coming to find, finally the taking to Himself,* this familiar and almost childlike language resembles sweet music by which Jesus seeks to alleviate the agony of separation in the minds of the apostles. Thus ends the first conversation, called forth by the question of Peter : "Why cannot I follow thee ?" Answer : "Even thy martyrdom would not be sufficient to this end ; my return in the Spirit into thy heart : this is the condition of thy entrance into my heavenly glory." Comp. iii. 5.

But Jesus observes that many questions were still rising in their minds, that their hearts were a prey to many doubts, and, in order to incite them to ask Him, He throws out to their ignorance a sort of challenge, by saying to them :

Ver. 4. "*And whither I go you know, and the way you know.*"<sup>1</sup>—We translate according to the received reading, which has in its favor 14 Mjj., the *Peschito* and most of the manuscripts of the *Itala*. According to it, Jesus attributes to the disciples the knowledge both of the *end* and of the *way*. According to the Alexandrian reading : "And whither I go, you know the way," He attributes to them only the knowledge of the *way*. The difference is not great. For if, according to the second reading, the knowledge of the end is not declared, it is certainly implied, and this by reason of ver. 2, where the end (*the Father's house*) had been clearly pointed out. But did the apostles know the way to reach it ? Yes and no ; yes, since this way was Jesus and Jesus was what they knew better than anything else. No, in the sense that they did not know Him as the way. This is the reason why, if Jesus can say to them with truth : *You know the way*, Thomas can answer him with no less truth : *We know it not*. Preoccupied until then with another end, the earthly kingdom of the Messiah, their imagination had not transferred their hopes from the world to God, from the earth to heaven ; they were thinking, in fact, like the Jews (xii. 34) : "*We have heard that the Christ abides forever* (on the earth, which is glorified by Him) ; *how then dost thou say, The Son of man must be lifted up ?*" Comp. Acts i. 6. And this false end to a certain extent veiled the truth from them. It is Thomas, the disciple who was particularly positive in his spirit, who becomes here, as at other times, the organ of doubting thoughts and discouraged feelings which exist more or less in them all ; comp. xi. 16, xx. 25.

### 3. Vv. 5-7.

Vv. 5, 6. "*Thomas says to him, Lord, we know not whither thou goest, and how do we know the way ?*"<sup>2</sup> 6. *Jesus says to him, I am the way and the truth and the life ; no one comes to the Father but by me.*"—Peter desired to follow

<sup>1</sup> Instead of the words οιδάτε και την οδον (do we know the way?) instead of δυνάμεθα την οδον ειδεναί (can we know the way?) in T. R. with 15 Mjj.

<sup>2</sup> BCL It<sup>alg</sup> omit και before πως.

<sup>3</sup> BCD It<sup>alg</sup> ; οίδαμεν την οδον (do we know

the way?) instead of δυνάμεθα την οδον ειδεναί (can we know the way?) in T. R. with 15 Mjj. Syr. It<sup>alg</sup>.

Jesus immediately ; this request having been rejected, Thomas wishes at least to understand clearly what is to take place, whither Jesus is going and by what way, and the more because the disciples are one day to follow Him. Thus far, the departure of Jesus leaves him nothing but obscurity. End and way, everything is lost for him in vacancy. Jesus, in His reply, lays hold especially upon the idea of *the way* while recalling to mind clearly the end in the second part of the verse. From the connection of these words with the question of Thomas it follows that the dominant idea of the three following terms is that of *way*, and that the other two must serve to explain it. From the second part of the verse it is also clear that the way which is in question is that which leads to the Father and His house, and not the way by which one can come to the truth and the life, as *Reuss* formerly supposed. The figurative expression *way* is therefore explained without a figure by the two terms : *truth* and *life*. Truth is God *revealed* in His essence, that is to say, in His holiness and love (ver. 9). Life is God *communicated* to the soul and bringing to it a holy strength and perfect beatitude (ver. 23). And as it is in Jesus that this revelation and communication of God to the soul are effected, so it is through Jesus also that the soul comes to the Father and obtains through Him the entrance into the Father's house. The three terms, *way*, *truth* and *life*, are not, therefore, co-ordinated (*Luther*, *Calvin* : beginning, middle, end) ; no more do they express a single notion : *vera via vitæ* (*Augustine*). Jesus means to say : I am the means of coming to the Father (the way), in that I am the truth and the life.—*Reuss* justly observes with reference to the word *I am*, that this expression excludes every other means parallel to this. *Gess* : “A man can at the most *show* to others the right way ; he cannot *be* either the way or the truth or the life.”—In the following clause, the words : *to the Father*, set forth a nearer end than the figurative expression of ver. 2. The question here is of communion with the Father here on earth, which is the condition of communion with Him in heaven (*His house*).

Ver. 7. “If you had known<sup>1</sup> me, you would have known<sup>2</sup> my Father also ; and<sup>3</sup> from henceforth you know him and have seen him.”—This verse reproduces the idea of the last clause of the preceding verse, that of coming to the Father through Jesus. If Jesus is really the manifestation of God (ver. 6), to have well known Him Himself would be enough for the arriving through Him at the knowledge of God (pluperfect ἐγνώκατε). This is the sense of the received reading which is perfectly suitable ; it is also that of the reading of some Alexandrian authorities which read ἦδείτε for the second ἐγνώκατε. It seems that Jesus hereby denies to them this twofold knowledge ; and in fact it is only after having received the Spirit that they will possess it fully (ver. 20). Yet He afterwards partially concedes it to them, because they possess the beginning of it already. *Meyer* takes the term *from henceforth* literally : “since my preceding declaration” (that of ver. 6). This sense is too restricted and even insignificant. *Chrysostom* and

<sup>1</sup> Ἰ D : ἐγνώκατε (*have known*), instead of ἐγνώκετε (*had known*).

<sup>2</sup> Ἰ D : γνώσεσθε (*you will know*) ; T, R, with

A N Γ, etc. : ἐγνώκετε αν (*you would have known*) ; B C L Q X : αν ἦδ-ετε.

<sup>3</sup> B C L Q X omit και.

*Lücke* find here an anticipatory indication of the approaching illumination at Pentecost; but how can the *from henceforth* and the pluperfects allow this sense? Jesus alludes to all that has just occurred in the course of this last evening. The washing of the feet and the dismissal of Judas, with all that He had said to them since then, were well fitted to bring to light the true character of God and the spiritual nature of His kingdom. The germ of the true knowledge of God had from henceforth been deposited in them. By showing Himself to them, as He had just done, even the inmost depths of His heart, Jesus had revealed to them forever the essence of God. The reading of  $\aleph D$ , adopted by *Tischendorf* (8th ed.) : "If you *have known me*, you *will know* my Father also," comes doubtless from the scruple which the copyists felt at making Jesus say that His disciples had not known Him up to that moment (see *Luthardt*).—*Weiss*, accepting the reading of some Alexandrian authorities which omit the *kai* (*and*) before  $\acute{\alpha}\pi' \acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\iota$ , *from henceforth*, makes  $\gamma\iota\nu\acute{\omega}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\tau\epsilon$  an imperative, in this sense : "Know Him from henceforth as He is revealed to you in me, and thereby you will have seen Him ; you will be in possession of the life." But this imperative scarcely suits the adverb : *from henceforth* ; and we do not say : Know God, as we say : "Believe in God" (ver. 1).

This last word : *you have seen Him*, seems intended, as already ver. 4, to call forth the expression of some opposite thought. It is, as it were, a new challenge offered to this inward trouble which Jesus perceives in them. To have become *beholders* of God (perfect,  $\epsilon\omega\rho\acute{\alpha}\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon$ )—was it not the greatest thing which the apostles could desire? This privilege had, to a certain degree, been granted to Moses and to Elijah, under the old covenant. Certainly, if Jesus could cause them to enjoy it, their faith would for the future be immovable. Isaiah had positively made this promise for the Messianic times : "The glory of the Lord shall be manifested, and all flesh shall see it" (Is. xl. 5). Thus is the demand of Philip naturally explained : "Thou sayest : *you have seen* ; we answer : show us!"

4. Vv. 8-21.

Vv. 8, 9. "Philip says to him, Lord, show us the Father, and it suffices us. 9. Jesus says to him, So long a time am I with you, and thou hast not known me! Philip, he who has seen me, has seen the Father; and<sup>2</sup> how sayest thou, Show us the Father?"—On occasion of these interruptions which the disciples allow themselves to make, *Gess* observes how fully at ease they feel with the Lord, and how fully this sort of relation justifies the words : "I have called you my friends," xv. 15.—Peter had asked to follow Jesus. Thomas had desired at least to know whither He was going, and by what way. Since they can neither *follow* nor *understand* clearly, Philip would at least have a pledge of the glorious future which is reserved for them ; and what pledge more sure than an appearance of God Himself ! Is not the desire for the immediate sight of God an aspiration which dwells in the deepest recess of the

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph D L Q$  : τοσούτω χρόνω, instead of τοσούτον χρόνον.

<sup>2</sup>  $\aleph B Q$  10<sup>1</sup>er14 Vulg. Cop. πως instead of και πως.

heart of man? Comp. the request of Moses, Exod. xxxiii. 18. It was the same point of view as that of the Jews when they asked of Jesus a sign from heaven. This desire would be well founded if the essence of God consisted in power; the true theophany might in that case consist in a resplendent manifestation. But God is holiness and love; the real manifestation of these moral perfections can only consist in a moral life such that in it, in its acts and words, the moral perfection of the divine character shall shine forth. Now this unique spectacle, this perfect theophany, the visible resplendence of God, the disciples have had before their eyes for more than two years; how is it that they have not better appreciated the privilege which has been accorded to them? What majesty in this reply! The foundation of the human consciousness of Jesus is so thoroughly the feeling of His divinity, that He scarcely understands that the knowledge of His true nature has not formed itself in the hearts of His disciples.—The word of address: *Philip*, serves to recall this disciple to himself as he forgets himself at the point of making such a demand. We may, like *Lutherdt*, write this vocative with the preceding sentence which is addressed to the disciple individually, or connect it with the following, which, as a general maxim, serves to bring back the apostle to the truth. The perfect tenses, *ἐγνώκας, ἑώρακός, ἑώρακε, hast known, has seen*, contrast the permanent state with the sudden and isolated act expressed by the aorist *δείξον, show us*.—The idea of the simple moral union of Jesus with God cannot exhaust the meaning of these words. A Christian, even a perfected one, would not say, “He who has seen me has seen the Christ.” How much less could a man, even a perfect man, say, “He who has seen me, has seen the Father.” This expression is understood only as the Son continues here below, under the form of the human life, the revealing function which He possesses, as the Word, in His condition of divine life.

Vv. 10, 11. “*Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and that the Father is in me? The words that I speak<sup>1</sup> unto you, I speak not of myself; and the Father, who dwells in me, he does the works.<sup>2</sup> 11. Believe me when I say to you that I am in the Father, and that the Father is in me; and, if not, believe me<sup>3</sup> because of the works.*”—Jesus indicates to Philip two signs by which he ought to have recognized and may even at this moment recognize in Him the true appearance of God. He does not say that the Father and Himself are one and the same person. He constantly prays to the Father, saying: *Thou*. But it is a union by which they live *the one in the other* (comp. *Gess*), and this relation has as its background the life of the Logos. The words *Believest thou not?* show Philip that his prayer must be regarded as inconsistent with his faith.—There are in the union of Jesus with the Father two aspects: *I in the Father*: Jesus emptying Himself in order to transfer Himself to God; and *the Father in me*: God communicating to Jesus all His wealth of strength and wisdom. On one side, Jesus making a void in Himself; on the other, God filling this void.—After this, Jesus characterizes

<sup>1</sup> B L N X Cop. read *λέγω* instead of *λάλω*.

*ποιοι τα εργα.*

<sup>2</sup> N B D read *αυτου* after *εργα* (*his works*) and reject *αυτος*. L X add *αυτος* (*himself*) after

<sup>3</sup> The *μοι* (*me*) is omitted by N B L It<sup>alg</sup> Vulg. Syr.



through the Holy Spirit and will continue through them here on earth the work which He has Himself begun here. Such is the thought of the whole following passage, vv. 12-24. The question of Judas does not introduce a new subject ; it affords Jesus the occasion of finishing the preceding development. — According to *Keil*, ver. 12 has as its purpose to reassure the disciples with regard to their future apostolic activity, respecting which they were anxious. According to *Weiss*, Jesus desires to show them how their own works will take the place of His, which are about to fail them and by reason of which, nevertheless, they are attached to Him. But there is no longer a question of these ideas in what follows. The question is now of the spiritual reunion which will follow the impending separation, and which will prepare the way for the final reunion promised in vv. 1-3. Ver. 12 forms the transition to this new promise. Jesus begins by setting forth the *effect* (the works which they will do), in order to go back to the *cause* (His power acting in them). The expression : *shall do the works which I do*, refers to miracles similar to those of Jesus, which were wrought by the apostles, and the following expression : *he shall do even greater things*, refers, not to more extraordinary outward works—the greatness of miracles is not thus measured (*Weiss*)—but to works of a superior nature even to corporeal healings. What St. Peter did at Pentecost, and St. Paul did throughout the world,—what a simple preacher, a simple believer effects in causing the Spirit to descend into a heart—Jesus could not do during His sojourn on earth. For, in order that such things should be realized, it was necessary “that the wall of separation between God and men should have been destroyed and the Holy Spirit have been given to mankind” (*Gess*) ; in other words, that, as the end of the verse says, the glorification of Jesus should have been accomplished : “because I go to the Father ;” comp. vii. 39. The branch, united to the vine, can bear fruits which the vine itself cannot bear. *Greater* does not, therefore, mean here : more stupendous, but more excellent ; and this term does not refer merely to the *extension* of the apostolic ministry beyond the limits of the theocracy, as *Lücke*, *Tholuck*, *Olshausen*, *de Wette* understand it—this difference is here only secondary—but to the *nature* of the works accomplished.

This superiority of spiritual productiveness promised to the disciples will be founded upon the exaltation of Christ's own position : “Because I go to the Father.” We see clearly here that the expression : *to go to the Father*, denotes not death only, but death and the ascension together.—Jesus says, according to the Alexandrian authorities : *to the Father*, not : *to my Father*. Indeed, God shows Himself, in thus acting, as the Father of the disciples no less than of Jesus Himself.—We must not close the explanation which the *because* leads us to look for with ver. 12, by making ver. 13, as *Westcott* would still have it, a principal clause. Ver. 13 necessarily belongs to this explanation. It is not sufficient that Jesus should be exalted ; it is necessary that He should still act from the midst of His glory : *because I go . . . and . . . I will do it*. *Kai* : and thus. *Whatsoever you shall ask* indicates the disciple's part in these works ; it must not be passed over in silence ; otherwise Jesus could not say *they will do them* (ver. 12). This

part will be simply prayer. The believer asks, and the all-powerful Christ works from the midst of His glory. But the question here is not of prayer in general. It is to prayer of a special kind that Jesus attributes this efficacious co-operation with Him, *to prayer in His name*. To ask in the name of any one is, in ordinary life, to ask in place of a person, as if on his part, and applying to oneself, in virtue of His recommendation, all his titles to the favor demanded. If we had only this passage in which the expression : to pray *in the name of Jesus*, were used, we should accordingly think that to pray thus is to ask something in the assured consciousness of our reconciliation with God and our adoption in Christ, to pray to God as if we were the representatives, and, in some sort, the mouth of Jesus. But is this explanation, in itself very natural and the one which I adopted in the preceding editions, applicable to the passage xiv. 26 : "The Holy Spirit whom my Father will send *in my name*"? It does not seem to me so. The other explanations do not appear to satisfy this requirement any more fully ; thus those of *Chrysostom*, "pleading my name ;" of *Calov*, "on the foundation of my merits ;" of *Lücke, Meyer, Gess*, etc., "praying in communion with me, from the midst of the spiritual element of my own life ;" of *de Wette*, "in view of my cause ;" or of *Weiss*, "in so far as it is a matter of works done for the accomplishment of the mission which I give you." All these explanations are true, certainly, but they touch only one side of the idea, not the centre. I think, therefore, that we must rather abide by that of *Hengstenberg, Keil* and *Westcott* (with differing shades) : to ask a thing of God as Father *on the foundation of the revelation* which Jesus has given us of Himself and of His work, or, as *Keil* says, "plunging by faith into the knowledge which we have received of Him as Son of God humbled and glorified." By acting thus we necessarily address to God a prayer which has all the characteristics set forth in the preceding explanations. This sense answers also to that of the term *the name* in the Scriptures. For the *name* sums up the knowledge which we possess of a being ; it is his reflection in our thought. This sense applies very satisfactorily to the formula of ver 26.—*I will do it*, says Jesus ; He thus sets forth the greatness of His future position as the organ of omnipotence acting in the service of the fatherly love of God. Had He not said in ver. 1 : "Believe in God, and believe also *in me*."—And all this will take place, Jesus adds, *for the glory of the Father* in the person of the Son, for the Son does not dream of founding a kingdom here on earth which shall belong to Him alone.

Ver. 14 is a reaffirmation of that astonishing promise ; this is indicated already by the asyndeton : "Yes, it will indeed be so !"—By the words : *ὅτι ἄν, whatsoever*, Jesus opens an immeasurable field to the Christian ambition of His disciples. The received reading *ἐγὼ ποιήσω*, "*I will do it*," is certainly the true reading. Some Alexandrian authorities have mechanically reproduced verbatim the expression of ver. 13. But Jesus purposely modifies it, by substituting *ἐγὼ* for *τοῦτο* : "*I, who have never deceived you, and who am to be clothed with omnipotence with my Father, I pledge myself to do it*." Thus, while His disciple shall pray in His name on the earth, He will act from heaven, on God's part, to execute the work, so intimate will be the

union effected in Him between heaven and earth.—It seems to me absolutely impossible to keep in the text the *με*, *me*, which the Alexandrian authorities give as the object of *αἰτήσητε* : “Whatsoever you shall ask *me* in my name.” It is inadmissible that one should ask anything of a person in his own name, except in the sense : for his own cause, which cannot be that of this phrase. *Tischenorff*, *Weiss* and *Westcott* endeavor vainly to defend this reading. Comp. besides, xv. 16, xvi. 23, 24.—To weigh the words which are constantly found at the beginning of all the epistles of St. Paul : “I cease not to make mention of you in my prayers,” is, as *Stier* has said, sufficient to give us an understanding that it is by prayer in the name of Jesus that the apostles gave existence to the Church.—From the means by which they will perform these works superior to His own—prayer in His name,—Jesus now passes to the divine source which shall give birth to such prayer in their hearts—the Holy Spirit.

Vv. 15–17. “If you love me, keep<sup>1</sup> my commandments. 16. And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another support, that he may abide<sup>2</sup> with you eternally, 17. the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it sees him not neither knows him ;<sup>3</sup> but<sup>4</sup> you know him, because he abides with you ; and he shall be<sup>5</sup> in you.”—Here is the supreme gift, because it is the source of all the rest, through the prayers which it inspires in the believer. And first, ver. 15, the moral condition necessary to the end that this gift should be granted to man. A preparation is needed : “Love me ! Fulfil my will !” Ver. 17 will justify this moral condition. The commandments of which Jesus speaks are the charges which He has given them while He has been with them, and particularly the instructions which He has given them on this last evening (xiii. 14, 15, 34, xiv. 1). The T. R., with almost all the Mjj., the *Itala* and the *Peschito*, reads the imperative *τηρήσατε*, *keep*, while B L read *τηρήσετε*, *you will keep*. The first is a direct summons to obedience in the name of the love which they have for Him. The second contains a reflection on the necessary relation between the two things. It seems to me that there is no reason to hesitate between these two readings. The second probably arises from the following future : *and I will pray*.—To the moral condition Jesus adds the objective condition, or the efficient cause of the divine gift, His own intercession. This intercession will have for its object the gift of the Holy Spirit. The words of xvi. 26, where it is said : “I say not unto you that I will pray the Father for you,” refers to the time which follows after this gift.—The term *παρακλήτος*, literally, *called towards*, was taken by *Origen* and *Chrysostom* in the active sense : *comforter παρακλήτωρ* (Job xvi. 2 in the LXX). It was under the influence of the Vulgate that this false sense passed into our French versions. It is acknowledged at the present day that the word *παρακλήτος*, of the passive form, must have a passive sense : he who *is called* as a sustaining help, as a support ; it is precisely the meaning of the Latin term *advocatus*, and of

<sup>1</sup> Instead of *τηρήσατε* (*keep*), B L Cop. :

*τηρήσετε* (*you will keep*) ; N : *τηρήσατε*.

<sup>2</sup> N B L Q X I<sup>tr</sup>ierique Cop. Syr. : η (*may be*) instead of *μην* (*may abide*).

<sup>3</sup> N B a omit the second *αυτο*.

<sup>4</sup> N B Q omit *δε* after *υμεις*.

<sup>5</sup> D D 5 Mnn. It. Syr. : *εστιν* (*is*), instead of *εσται* (*will be*) in all the other Mjj.

our word *advocate*: the defender of the accused before the tribunal. Perhaps the term used by Jesus was *Goël*, champion, defender. The Greek term has this meaning also in profane Greek, as in Demosthenes, Diogenes Laertius, Philo. John himself gives it this meaning in his first Epistle ii. 1, “*We have a paraclete (advocate) with the Father, Jesus Christ, the righteous.*” The meaning *teacher* (*Theodore of Mopsuestia, Ernesti, Hofmann, Luthardt*) has no foundation philologically, and the expression *the Spirit of truth* (ver. 17) is not sufficient to justify it. What Jesus will ask of the Father on their behalf is, therefore, another supporter, ever within their reach, ever ready to come to their aid, at the first call, in their conflict with the world. From this fundamental signification the following applications easily proceed: support in moments of weakness; counsellor in the difficulties of life; consoler in suffering. Thereby He will do for them what the beloved Master, who was now leaving them, had done during these last years. By saying *another*, Jesus implicitly gives *Himself* the title of Paraclete; it is an error, therefore, to find here a difference of idea from that in the first Epistle (ii. 1). This gift which the Father will make to them, will come not only at the request of Jesus, but, as He says in xv. 26, through His mediation: “*The Paraclete whom I will send to you from my Father.*” As it is He who asks for Him on our part, so also it is He who sends on God’s part. And He will not come, soon to withdraw Himself, as Jesus does; but His dwelling in them will be eternal. *Meyer* understands *εις τον αιωνα*: “*even to the coming age.*” But the word *αιων*, in the N. T. as in the classics (*εις αιωνος, δι’ αιωνος, εις αιωνα*) denotes an indefinite duration, and, with the article, eternity.—The Holy Spirit, a divine being, sent from the Father, to take the place of a mere man—supposing that Jesus were only this—is this conceivable?

The appositional words, *the Spirit of truth* (ver. 17), serve to explain the term *Paraclete*, which was still obscure to the disciples. This expression can neither signify who *is* the truth—it is Jesus who is the truth, nor who *possesses* the truth,—this would be useless. The teaching of the Spirit is here contrasted with that of the word, as in xvi. 25. The teaching by means of the word can never give anything more than a confused idea of divine things; however skilfully this means may be used, it can only produce in the soul of the hearer an image of the truth; so Jesus compares it to a parable (xvi. 25). The teaching of the Spirit, on the contrary, causes the divine truth to enter into the soul; it gives to it a full reality within us by making us have experience of it; it alone makes the word a truth for us.—But, as Jesus has already intimated in ver. 15, in order to be fitted to receive this divine teacher, a moral preparation is necessary. The soul in which He comes to dwell must be already withdrawn from the profane sphere. This is the reason why Jesus says: *Keep my instructions*; and the reason why He here adds: *whom the world cannot receive.* It was not owing to any arbitrary action that, on the morning of the day of Pentecost, the Spirit descended on one hundred and twenty persons only, and not on all the inhabitants of Jerusalem: the former only had undergone the indispensable preparation. Jesus explains wherein this preparation which is

wanting in the world consists : it is necessary to have *seen* and *known* the Spirit, in order to receive Him. The Spirit identifies Himself too intimately with our personal life to allow the possibility of His being imposed upon us ; that He may come to us, He must be desired and called, and for this end we must already have, in some manner, formed acquaintance with Him. But how can this be, if one has not yet received him ? The example of the disciples teaches us. During the years which they had passed in the society of Jesus, His word, His acts, constant emanations of the Spirit, had furnished them the means of *beholding* this divine agent in His most perfect manifestation and of *knowing* what was most holy and exalted in Him, and their hearts had rendered homage to the perfection of this inspiration from above which constantly animated their Master. This had not been done by *the world*, the Jews, who, on hearing Jesus speak, said : “He has a demon,” and who, on seeing His miracles, ascribed them to Beelzebub. They thus remained strangers to the action of the Spirit, they even became hostile to it ; this is the reason why they were not in a condition to *receive* Him. It is impossible for me to understand what meaning *Weiss* can give to the two verbs : *to see* and *to know*, outside of this explanation and without falling into the *petitio principii* : in order to receive the Spirit, it is necessary to see Him ; and in order to see Him, it is necessary to have Him. If a reply is made by saying that these two present tenses : *to see* and *to know*, are presents of anticipation, which refer to the time when the disciples *will have received* the Spirit, the fact is forgotten that the question here is of the moral conditions *for* receiving Him.—The preparatory action of the Spirit on the disciples is expressed by the words : *He dwells with you* ; and the more intimate relation which He will form with them from the day of Pentecost by the words : “He shall be *in you*.” We must not, therefore, read either, in the first clause, *μενεί* (in the future), *shall dwell*, with the *Vulgate*, nor, in the second, *ἰστί, is*, with the *Vatican* and *Cambridge MSS.* The whole meaning of the sentence lies precisely in the antithesis between the present *dwells* (comp. *μένων*, ver. 25) and the future *shall be*. This contrast of time is completed by that of the two limiting words : *with you* (comp. *παρ’ ὑμῶν* of ver. 25) and *in you*.—To make the last clause : *And he shall be in you*, depend on the *ὅτι, because*, which precedes, leads to no reasonable meaning : You know Him now because He will be in you ! This last phrase expresses, on the contrary, a new fact, an advance of the highest importance : “*And thus*, in virtue of the knowledge which you have gained of Him by beholding Him in my person, He will be able to come *into you*.” This distinction between the preparatory action of the Spirit *on* man (by means of His historical manifestations in Christ, and then in the Church) and His real dwelling *in* the individual, is, as it were, at the present day effaced in the consciousness of Christianity, and the confounding of two such different positions involves incalculable consequences.—“Until now Jesus, living *with* them, had been their support ; now they will have the support *in their own hearts*.” (*Gess*) ; and this support will be the Holy Spirit, that is to say again, Jesus Himself in another form ; it is this last idea so delight-

ful to the hearts of the disciples which the following words, vv. 18-23, develop.

Vv. 18, 19. "*I will not leave you orphans : I come again to you. 19. Yet a little while, and the world shall see me no more ; but you shall see me ; because I live, you shall live also.*"—The term *orphans* is in harmony with the address *my little children* (xiii. 33) ; it is the language of the dying father. The *asyndeton* between ver. 18 and the preceding verse is sufficient to prove the essential identity of thought between these words and those of vv. 16, 17. This form, as we have seen, indicates in general a more emphatic affirmation of the thought already expressed. This observation consequently sets aside every other explanation of the words : *I come again to you*, than that which refers them to the return of Jesus through the Holy Spirit (vv. 16, 17). This is the explanation of almost all the modern writers (even of *Meyer* and *Luthardt*, 2d ed.). Moreover, this explanation is the only possible one, because of the entire following passage, vv. 19-23, which can only be the development of the 18th verse (see especially vv. 21, 23). Nevertheless, some refer this promise to the appearances of the risen Jesus (*Chrysostom*, *Erasmus*, *Grotius*, *Hilgenfeld*). Even *Weiss* joins them, abandoning thus his own explanation of *ἐρχομαι*, *I come*, in ver. 3. But these appearances had a momentary character and were not a true return of Jesus ; comp. the remarkable expression, Luke xxiv. 44 : "while *I was* yet with you." The purpose of these appearances was only to establish the faith of the disciples in the resurrection of Jesus, and thereby to prepare for His return in spirit into their hearts, but not to accomplish it. How could these appearances be His return, since His *ὑπάγειν*, His departure, includes at once His death and His ascension (ver. 28, xiii. 1) ? The return must be, therefore, posterior to the latter.—The application of ver. 18 to the Parousia (*Augustine*, *Hofmann*, *Luthardt*, 1st ed.) is also impossible ; comp. vv. 19, 23 : in ver. 19, the *seeing* of Jesus *again* coincides with His disappearance for the world ; and according to ver. 23, the return to believers is described as purely inward, while of the final coming it is said : "*And every eye shall see him.*" All that can and must be granted is, that the appearances of the Risen One served to *prepare for* and render possible His return through the Holy Spirit, and that this spiritual coming of Christ will have its consummation in the coming of the glorified Saviour.—The Spirit is, no doubt, *another* support in that His action differs from that of Jesus as visible ; but His coming is, nevertheless, the return of Jesus Himself. The Spirit is not the substitute for Jesus, as *Weiss* asserts ; otherwise the promise of the Paraclete would answer only imperfectly to the need of the disciples, whose hearts demanded the return of the Master Himself. If then *Weiss* alleges that the word *I come* can only denote a personal coming, we say in reply that it is indeed Christ in person whom the Holy Spirit gives to us. As to xvi. 22, which *Weiss* also alleges, see on that passage. *Tholuck* has concluded from the expression *I come*, that the Holy Spirit is only the person of Jesus Himself spiritualized, and *Reuss* affirms that "although the literal exegesis argues for the distinction of persons (between Christ and the Spirit), practical logic refuses to admit it." He "even hazards the opinion

that in the discourses of Jesus the abstract notion of the Word is replaced by the more concrete notion of the Spirit." John is innocent of such serious confusion. As no writer of the old covenant would have used the terms Spirit of God and Angel of the Lord one for the other, so the confounding of the Word with the Spirit is inadmissible in a writer of the new covenant. No doubt, St. Paul says : "*The Lord is the Spirit*" (2 Cor. iii. 17). But he does not for this reason confound the person of the glorified Lord with the Holy Spirit. This is a region in which it is of importance to take account of shades of thought. According to xvi. 14, the Spirit is, not the Lord, but the power which *glorifies* Him, which makes Him appear, live and grow within us, and that by taking what is His and communicating it to us. The parts of each are perfectly distinct. They are as distinct in the work of Pentecost as in that of the incarnation. In begetting Jesus in the womb of Mary, the Holy Spirit did not become the Christ. After the same manner, the Holy Spirit, by glorifying Jesus and making Him live in us, does not for this reason become Jesus. The Word is the principle of the outward revelation, the Spirit that of the inward revelation. Jesus is the object to be assimilated ; the Spirit is the power by which the assimilation is accomplished. Without the objective revelation given in Jesus, the Spirit would have nothing to fertilize in us ; without the Spirit, the revelation granted in Jesus remains outside of us and is like a parable which is not understood. Hence it follows that the Spirit who comes is, in a sense, Jesus who comes again ; from one without us, Jesus becomes one within us. The consummated work of the Spirit is *Christ formed* in the believer, or, what expresses the same idea, it is the believer having reached *the perfect stature of Christ* (Gal. iv. 19, Eph. iv. 13). How can *Weiss* say that this idea is Pauline, not Johannean ? Jesus' *being* in the believer is of the same nature as God's *being* in the person of Christ, according to xvii. 22, 23. This idea includes that which we have just developed. It is contained in the expression *ἐν χριστῷ*, which has no other meaning in Paul than it has in John.

The words : *Yet a little while* (ver. 19), are in accordance with the present *I come*. They reduce to nothing, so to speak, the duration of the separation.—The *asyndeton* leads us to see in what follows a development of the promise of ver. 18.—The sight of which Jesus speaks is to be permanent, as is indicated by the present *θεωρεῖτε*, *you see me* ; it is that constant inward contemplation which St. Paul describes in the words which are so similar to the ones before us, 2 Cor. iii. 18 : "*We who behold the glory of the Lord with unveiled face.*" While the world, which has only known Jesus after the flesh, sees Him no more after He has physically disappeared, He becomes, from that moment, visible to His own in the spiritual sphere into which they are transported by the Spirit and in which they meet Him. The difference in the application of the word *θεωρεῖν*, *see*, in the two clauses proves nothing against this meaning ; it is precisely on this intentional difference that the meaning of the phrase rests ; comp. vv. 22, 23. This intimate intercourse is the source of all the strength of the Christian in his conflict with himself and with the world. This is the reason why, in what follows, the idea of *living* is, without any transition, substituted for that of seeing.

In the following phrase, the two clauses may be made dependent on  $\delta\tau\iota$  : "You see me because I live and *because* you also shall live." This is what is done by *Meyer, Luthardt, Weiss*, either in that they apply the whole to the new life produced by the Holy Spirit (Christ and the believers seeing each other again inasmuch as they are transported into the same sphere of life) ; or, as *Weiss*, by referring the seeing again to the appearances of the Risen One : "You see me again because you and I then live again." But the contrast between the present *I live* and the future *you shall live* is not sufficiently explained in these two interpretations. And in that of *Weiss* how are we to explain the word : *You shall live* ? The appearances of the Risen One did not make the disciples *live* ( $\zeta\eta\upsilon$ ) ; they renewed their courage. Life, throughout our entire gospel, is communicated by the Holy Spirit (vii. 39). A second construction consists in making the first clause alone depend on  $\delta\tau\iota$ , and explaining : "You see me (then), *because I live* ; and (as a consequence of this sight of me living) *you also shall live*." Our spiritual *sight* of Jesus results from His heavenly *life*, and this sight produces life in us. But the strongly accentuated opposition between the  $\epsilon\gamma\omega$ , *I*, and the  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\upsilon}\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ , *and you* or *you also*, causes us to prefer a third construction : that which makes the  $\delta\tau\iota$  depend on the following verb  $\zeta\eta\sigma\sigma\theta\epsilon$ , *you shall live* : *But you see me* (in opposition to *the world sees me no more*) ; *because I live, you shall live also*." They see Him ; and, as He whom they thus behold is living, this beholding communicates life to them.—By the present *I live*, Jesus transfers Himself, as in vv. 3 and 18, to the approaching moment when death shall be finally vanquished for Him and when He will live the perfect, indestructible life ; and by the future, *you shall live*, to the still more remote time when His glorified life will become theirs. Thus is the relation between *I live* and *you shall live* naturally explained ; comp. the similar relation between *I come* and *I will take*, in ver. 3. The present designates the principle laid down once for all, the future the daily, gradual, eternal consequences.

Vv. 20, 21. "In that day you shall know that I am in my Father and you in me and I in you. 21. He who has my commandments and keeps them, he it is who loves me ; and he who loves me shall be loved by my Father, and I will love him and will manifest myself to him."—The absence of a particle between these words and the preceding and following ones betrays the emotion with which Jesus contemplates and foretells the decisive day of Pentecost. It is, in a new form, the reaffirmation of the same promise.

The expression *that day* indicates a precise moment, not a period, as *Reuss* thinks. And as the great circumstances of Jesus' ministry connect themselves naturally with the Jewish feasts, and as the feast of the Passover, which was about to be the time of His death, was to be followed soon by that of Pentecost, there is nothing to prevent us from thinking, whatever *Lücke, de Wette, Weiss*, etc., may say, that the day of which He is here speaking was already in their view the day of Pentecost ; comp. the  $\epsilon\tau\iota\ \mu\iota\kappa\rho\nu$ , *in a little while*, ver. 19. However this may be, Jesus contrasts this day of the coming of the Spirit, whatever it is, with the present moment, when the disciples have so much difficulty in forming an idea of the relation of their Master to the Father (vv. 9, 10).  $\Upsilon\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ , *you* : "from your own

experience, and not only, as to-day, from my words." Comp. xvi. 25. The object of this spiritual illumination of believers will be, first, the relation of Jesus to the Father : they will have a consciousness of Jesus as of a being who lives and acts in God, and in whom God lives and acts as in another self. This immediate consciousness of the relations between Jesus and God will spring from the living consciousness which they will receive of their own relation to Jesus ; they will feel Him living in them and will feel themselves living in Him ; and in the experience of this relation to Him (*they transported into Him and He transported into them*), they will understand that which He had said to them, without succeeding in making Himself understood, of what God is to Him and what He is to God. Then, finally, the transcendent fact of the communion between Jesus and God will become for them the object of a distinct perception through the immediate experience of their own communion with Jesus. These are the *μεγαλεία τοῦ θεοῦ*, the *wonderful things of God*, which Peter and the disciples celebrate in new tongues on the day of Pentecost.

Ver. 21 states with preciseness the manner of this illumination. Jesus had said summarily, ver. 15 : "*Keep my commandments, and I will pray the Father.*" Here he enumerates in detail all the links of the chain of graces which will be connected with this practical fidelity of His followers : It is necessary to *hold inwardly* (*ἔχειν*) His word, and to *observe* it practically (*τηρεῖν*) ; this is not done by the world, which has heard it, but rejected it ; for this reason it is not fitted to receive these higher graces. By means of this moral fidelity, 1. Such an individual (*ἐκεῖνος*, that exceptional man) assumes the character of a being who truly loves Jesus (*ὁ ἀγαπῶν με*). 2. Hence he becomes *the beloved of the Father*, who, loving the Son, also loves whoever makes Him the object of his love. This love of the Father is not that which is spoken of in iii. 16 : "*God so loved the world.*" These two loves differ as the compassion of a man for his guilty and wretched neighbor and the tender affection of a father for his child, or a husband for his wife, differ. 3. The Son, seeing the eye of the Father turning with tenderness towards the disciple who loves Him, feels Himself united with the latter by a new bond ("*and I will love him*") ; He loves him still more tenderly in proportion as He sees the love of the Father enveloping him. 4. Finally, from all this follows the supreme miracle of the love of the Father and the Son : the perfect revelation which Jesus gives to the disciple of Himself : *I will manifest myself to him*. This is the condition of the *you shall know*, ver. 20. This altogether extraordinary term *ἐμφανίζειν* refers to the inward manifestation of the Messiah. It will not by any means suit the external and passing appearances of the Risen One, to which even *Weiss* gives up referring it ; but to substitute what ? Certain manifestations of the nearness of Jesus granted to His disciples in the course of their life, like that of the Lord to Moses (Exod. xxxiii. 13, 18) ; "*but in any case not by means of the Spirit,*" adds this interpreter. And yet the *asyndeta* after ver. 17 prove, by themselves alone, that Jesus is here developing the promise of the gift of the Spirit ; and ver. 23 shows clearly enough what Jesus means to speak of in ver. 21. It is precisely this wholly inward character of the manifestation

described in ver. 21 which calls forth the question of Judas in ver. 22.—In the face of these interruptions of the disciples, *Gess* compares Jesus to a skilful pilot who does not suffer himself to be turned aside by the rushing waves, but by a prompt stroke of the helm gives each time to the ship the desired direction.

## 5. Vv. 22-24.

Ver. 22. "*Judas, not Iscariot, says to him, Lord, and<sup>1</sup> what is come to pass, that thou art to show thyself to us, and not to the world?*"—The mode of the revelation of which Jesus had just spoken entirely perplexed the minds of the disciples, which were ever directed towards the outward manifestation, visible for all, of the Messiah-King and His glorious kingdom. It was especially in the lower group of the apostolic company, influenced by the carnal spirit of Iscariot, that such thoughts persistently continued. The Judas or Jude here mentioned bears this name only in Luke (Gosp. vi. 16, Acts i. 13). In the catalogues of Matthew (x. 3) and Mark (iii. 18) he is designated by the names (surnames) *Lebbeus* and *Thaddæus*: the bold or the cherished one. He occupies one of the lowest places among the apostles. The explanation: *not Iscariot*, is intended to remove the supposition of a return of Judas after his going out, xiii. 30.—By saying: *What is come to pass?* Judas asks for the indication of a new fact causing the change of the Messianic programme, the proof of which he thinks he observes in the words of Jesus in ver. 21. The *καί, and*, before *τί γέγονεν*, is the expression of surprise; it was omitted in some MSS., as superfluous.—*To us* signifies here: "To us only."

Vv. 23, 24. "*Jesus answered and said to him, If any one loves me, he will keep my word; and my Father will love him and we will come to him, and make our abode<sup>2</sup> with him. 24. He who does not love me, does not keep my words; and the word which you hear is not mine, but the Father's who sent me.*"—Jesus continues His discourse, as if He had not heard the question of Judas; for the first part of ver. 23 is only the reproduction of ver. 21 developed and stated with greater precision. And yet He answers the question proposed, by more energetically reaffirming the promise, as well as the moral condition which had called forth the objection; comp. the same mode of replying in Luke xii. 41 ff. To love Jesus, to keep His word, to be loved by the Father,—these are the conditions on which the promised revelation will be made (ver. 23); now the world does not fulfil them; it is animated by dispositions of an opposite character (ver. 24).—As to the conditions and nature of this revelation, Jesus develops them grandly. The revelation of Himself which He will give to the believer will be nothing less than His own dwelling in his soul, and this will be one with the dwelling of God Himself within him. How can we think here only of the appearances of the Risen One, or even of temporary aid granted to the disciples by the glorified Lord in the work of their ministry? It is incomprehensible how *Weiss* can persist in such an interpretation to the very end.—Here, as in x. 30, Jesus says

<sup>1</sup> A B D E L X It<sup>er</sup>ique (not  $\aleph$ ) reject *καί* (*and*) before *τι*.

<sup>2</sup> Instead of *ποιησομεν*,  $\aleph$  B L X: *ποιησομεθα*.

we in speaking of *God* and *Himself*; this expression, if it is not blasphemous or absurd, implies the consciousness of His essential union with God.—The conception of the kingdom of God which we find here is not foreign to the Synoptics; comp. Luke xvii. 20: “*The kingdom of God comes not with observation; it is within you*” (ἐντὸς ὑμῶν); and Matt. xxviii. 18–20. A very similar figure is found in Apoc. iii. 20: “*If any one opens the door, I will enter in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me.*”—Ver. 2 proves that the term *μονή*, *dwelling*, can designate not only an inn, but the permanent domicile (see Passow). This expression perhaps places the idea of this verse in connection with that of ver. 2. Here on earth, it is God who makes His abode with the believer; in heaven, it will be the believer who will make his abode with God. The first of these facts (ver. 23) prepares for the second (ver. 3).—Weiss rests upon the *παρ’ αὐτῶ*, properly *near him*, to support the view that the question is not of an inward dwelling. The *unio mystica* between Christ and the believer, must have been designated, according to him, by *ἐν αὐτῶ*, *in him*. But the preposition *παρά*, *with*, is necessarily introduced by reason of the figure of a dwelling (*μονήν ποιῆν*) and cannot in any way serve to determine the mode of this union. And it follows from the terms *ἐμφανίζεω* and *πρὸς αὐτόν*, as from the parallel Apoc. iii. 20, that this mode is internal and spiritual.

Ver. 23 justified the *to us* in the question of Judas; ver. 24 answers to: *and not to the world*. Between the two clauses of ver. 24, this idea must be understood: “It is not a small thing to reject my teaching; and indeed (*καί*) it is the teaching of God Himself” (xii. 49, etc.). Conclusion understood: “How, with such a disposition, hostile to the word both of the Son and the Father, could one be fit to become their abode!” Comp. what was said of the *world* in vv. 15, 17.—Thus have the reasons for encouragement presented by the Lord been gradually raised one upon another: “You shall have a place secured for you with me in the Father’s house. . . . Through me, the way, you cannot fail to reach the end. . . . Already here on earth, you have seen the Father. . . . You shall be able to continue my work on the earth. . . . Another divine support will give you strength for it. . . . In this inward support, it is I myself who will join you again. . . . The Father Himself will with me come to dwell with you. . . .” Is there not here what may justify the: *Let not your heart be troubled* (xiv. 1)? The following passage, which closes this first outpouring, returns to its starting-point, in that it even makes the *Be not troubled*, a *Rejoice*.

#### 6. Vv. 25–31.

Vv. 25, 26. “*I have spoken these things to you while I am yet with you. 26. But the support, the Holy Spirit, whom my Father will send in my name, will teach you all things, and will bring all things to your remembrance which I have said to you.*” We might endeavor to connect these words with the preceding: for it is through the gift of the Holy Spirit, who is about to be spoken of again, that the great promise of vv. 22–24 will be accomplished. But the perfect *λελάληκα*, *I have spoken to you*, rather indicates a conclusion; the con-

versation reaches its end and returns now to its starting-point. Ver. 25 therefore is not to be connected with ver. 24 ; it recalls the contents of the entire discourse. What Jesus has just said to the disciples of the future reunion, above (vv. 1-3), and here below (vv. 12-24), is all that He can reveal to them on this subject for the moment. If this future is still enveloped in obscurity for them, the teaching of another master will dissipate the mists, and will explain to them all His promises by realizing them. *Ταῦτα, these things*, at the beginning, in contrast with *πάντα, all things* (ver. 26) : " This is what I am able to tell you now ; another will afterwards tell you *the whole*."—The epithet *holy* given to the Spirit, ver. 26, recalls the deep line of separation which Jesus had just drawn, in vv. 17, 24, between the profane world and the disciples already sanctified by their attachment to Jesus. As holy, the Spirit can only come to dwell in these last.—The expression : *in my name*, is to be explained, as in ver. 14, with this difference, that it refers here to an act of God (*shall send*), and no longer to the human act of prayer (*shall ask*). On the side of God, it is *sending* in virtue of the perfect revelation which He has given of the person and work of His Son ; while on man's side, it is asking in virtue of the more or less imperfect possession which he has gained of this revelation. *Weiss*, in despair of finding any satisfactory sense in the words *in my name*, if they are made to refer to the act of sending, applies them to the *object* of the mission : God will send the Holy Spirit to be *in the place of* Christ, as His substitute with believers. But the Spirit is not the substitute for Christ ; Christ Himself comes again in Him ; then, the grammatical relation of the limiting words *in my name* to the verb *send*, does not authorize this sense.—The pronoun *ἐκεῖνος, he*, he alone, brings into strong relief the person of this new teacher who will tell everything, in contrast with the earthly person of Jesus who is going to be taken away from them (ver. 25). The Spirit will do two things : *teach everything ; bring to remembrance everything* which Jesus has taught. These two functions are closely connected ; He will teach the new by recalling the old, and will recall the old by teaching the new. The words of Jesus, the remembrance of which the Spirit will awaken in them, will be the matter from which He will derive the teaching of the complete truth, the germ which He will fertilize in their hearts, as, in return, this internal activity of the Spirit will unceasingly recall to their memory some former word of Jesus, so that in proportion as He shall illuminate them, they will cry out : Now, I understand this word of the Master ! And this vivid clearness will cause other words long forgotten to come forth from forgetfulness. Such is, even at this day, the relation between the teaching of the written Word and that of the Spirit.—*Καί :* and specially.—Naturally the first *πάντα, all things*, embraces only the things of the new creation accomplished in Jesus Christ, the plan and work of salvation. The first creation, nature, is not the subject of the revelation of the Holy Spirit ; it is that of scientific study.

Vv. 27-29. " Peace I leave with you ; my peace I give to you ; not as the world gives, do I give it to you ; let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid. 28. You have heard how I said to you, I go away, and come to you. If

you loved me, you would have rejoiced because I<sup>1</sup> go to the Father; for my<sup>2</sup> Father is greater than I. 29. And now I have told you these things before they come to pass, that when they have come to pass, you may believe."—The promise of vv. 25, 26 had as its aim to tranquillize the disciples in relation to the *obscurities* which still hovered over their Master's future and their own. Vv. 27–29 tend to reassure them with reference to the dangers to which they see themselves exposed in this future which is opening before them. Jesus evidently alludes to the Israelite salutation: *Peace be unto thee (Schalom leka)*! Meyer and Reuss take the word *εἰρήνη* in an objective sense: *salvation* (שלום, full prosperity). But the adjective "*my peace*" and the end of the verse where the question is of causing *trouble* to cease, should have prevented this false interpretation. On leaving them, Jesus would make them enjoy a perfect inward quietness, such as that which they behold in Himself. This peace arises in Him, in the presence of death, from His absolute confidence in the love of the Father. This confidence it is which He wishes to inspire in them, and by means of which His peace will become theirs. This is the legacy which He gives them (*ἀφήμι, I leave*), and this legacy He draws from His own treasury: *my peace*. The verb *δίδωμι, I give*, is in connection with *ἐμὴν (mine)*: one *gives of his own*. In Luke x. 5, 6, Jesus confers on His disciples the power which He exercises here Himself: that of imparting *their* peace.—The contrast between the peace of Jesus and that of the world is ordinarily referred to the *nature* of the two: the peace of the world consisting in the enjoyment of blessings which are only such in appearance; that of Jesus in the possession of real and imperishable blessings. Luthardt and Keil find here another contrast: that between true and false peace. But it follows from the omission of the object: *peace*, in the second clause ("*I do not give as the world gives*"), and from the conjunction *καθώς (according as)*, that the contrast relates rather to the act of *giving* than to the object of the gift: "When I give, it is really giving, it is giving with efficacy, while, when the world says farewell to you in the ordinary form: Peace be unto you! it gives you only empty words, a powerless wish." I cannot understand wherein this sense is below the seriousness of the situation, as Meyer claims. This peace, which He communicates to them by this very word, should banish from their hearts the *trouble* which Jesus observes there still (*μὴ παρασίσθω*), and preserve them, even by this means, from the danger of *being afraid* (*δελιῆν*), which would result from this troubled state.

But it is not enough for Jesus to see them reassured, strengthened; He would even see them *joyous* (ver. 28). And they would really be so, if they well understood the meaning of this departure which is approaching. The *ἠκούσατε, you have heard*, refers to vv. 2, 12, 18; the quotation, as so often, is made freely.—Jesus adds: *and I come*, because without this He could not ask them to find in His departure a subject of joy. The words: "*If you loved me,*" signify here: If you loved Me in an entirely disinterested way, loving Me for Myself, and not for yourselves. These words are of an

<sup>1</sup> A B D K L X II 10 Mnn. It. Vulg. Syr. Cop. Orig. omit *εἶπον* between *οτι* and *πορευομαι* (because *I go away*), instead of: (because

*I said, I go away*).

<sup>2</sup> A B D L X 8 Mnn. It<sup>er</sup>ic<sup>que</sup> Vulg. reject *μου* after *πατρ*.

exquisite delicacy. Jesus thereby finds the means of making joy on their part a duty of affection. He turns their attention to the approaching exaltation of His position (comp. xiii. 3, 31, 32); and what true friend would not rejoice to see his friend raised to a state more worthy of him? Jesus does not here give expression to the idea of the more powerful activity of which this exaltation will be for Him the means (xvii. 12). He appeals only to their friendly hearts.—We must reject, with the Alexandrian authorities, the word *εἶπον* (the second) and read: *because I go away*, and not: “because *I said to you*, I go away.”—The reason why they should rejoice for Him on account of this change is that *His Father is greater than He*. In returning to God, therefore, He is going to find again a form of existence more free, more exalted, more blessed. Jesus felt the burden of the earthly existence, while patiently bearing it. Did He not say: “How long shall I be with you? How long shall I bear with you?” (Luke ix. 41.) His surrendering of divine existence, His acceptance of human existence was for Him an ordeal which was to cease through His exaltation to the presence of God; comp. the *πρὸς τὸν θεόν*, i. 1, 18. The explanation of *Lücke, de Wette*, etc., “God will be a better protector for you than I could be by my visible presence,” ignores the natural meaning of the words and what there is of the personal element in this appeal to their affection: *if you loved me*.—Since the second century of the Church exegesis has understood in two different ways the explanation which follows respecting the relation between the Father and the Son (see *Westcott's* excellent dissertation). Some have understood: “greater than the Logos as such,” inasmuch as the Father is very naturally superior to the Son, while others have referred this superiority of the Father merely to the human nature of Jesus. This second explanation does not seem to me possible, in the first place because, if the *state* of the Son can change, His person, His *ego*, remains ever identical with itself; the subject who is speaking at this moment cannot, therefore, be any other than the one who speaks in passages such as viii. 58, xvii. 5, 24. Then, applied merely to the human nature of Jesus, as apart from His divine nature, these words become almost blasphemous, or at least ridiculous. As *Weiss* says, “such a comparison between God and a created being would be a folly bordering upon blasphemy.” We have already recognized the fact, in studying the Prologue (i. 1), that the Logos, as such, is subordinate to God. As *Marius Victorinus* said (365): “As *having* everything from the Father, He is inferior to Him, although, as *having everything* from Him, He is His equal.” *Reuss* has wrongly seen a disagreement between these words and the divinity of Christ, as it is taught in the Prologue (i. 1). For even in the Prologue we find the notion of subordination expressly declared as it is here, and, on the other hand, our passage breathes, in Him who thus speaks, the most lively feeling of His participation in divinity. God alone can compare Himself with God, and the Arians, in seeking for a support in this text, have at least been guilty of unskilfulness. Here is certainly one of the passages by which the apostle was inspired in formulating his Prologue.

Ver. 29. This disappearance of Jesus, so contrary to their thoughts,

might in itself shake their faith ; but Jesus applies to this trial what He had said of the treachery of Judas : through the fact that He has foretold it to them, it will, on the contrary, turn to the strengthening of their faith. And now, finally, the summons to depart :

Vv. 30, 31. "*I will no more speak much with you ; for the prince of this world<sup>1</sup> is coming, and he has nothing in me.* 31. *But that the world may know that I love my Father and<sup>2</sup> that I act according as the Father has commanded me,<sup>3</sup> arise, let us go hence.*"—Jesus feels the approach of His invisible enemy. There is here not merely the presentiment of the near arrival of Judas, but also of the conflict which He will have to undergo with Satan in Gethsemane.

Two quite different explanations of these verses may be given, the result of which, however, is fundamentally the same. Either the *and, καί*, before *ἐν ἐμοί*, is understood in a concessive sense : "*He comes, and [in truth] he has nothing in me* which can be a reason for his power over me ;" then Jesus adds : "*but (ἀλλά)* in order that the world may know the love which I have for my Father, I yield myself to him freely. *Arise !*" Or this *καί, and*, may be taken in the adversative sense, as so frequently in John : "*He is coming ; but he has no hold upon me ; nevertheless (ἀλλά)*, in order that the world may know, . . . *arise and let us go hence*, and that I may be delivered to this enemy !" This second meaning seems to me to present a clearer thought ; *καί* is frequently adversative in John, and we have explained the reason of it ; comp. e.g. vi. 36 and xv. 24.—"*No more speak much*" does not exclude the few discourses which are still to follow.—*The prince of this world*, see xii. 31.—*Nothing in me* : nothing which appertains to his domain and which gives him a right and power over me, the object of his hatred. These words imply in Him who utters them the consciousness of the most perfect innocence. The *in order that* has often been made dependent on *ποιῶ, I do* ; "*In order that the world may know . . . my love for my Father, . . . I am going to do according to what He has commanded me.*" But the *καί*, before *καθώς*, does not allow this construction. Or the *ive* has been made to depend on a verb understood : "*This happens thus* in order that the world may know that I love my Father, *and that* I do what he has commanded me ;" so *Tischendorf* ; and this would be better. But how much more lively is a third construction, which makes the *in order that* depend on the two following imperatives : "*In order that the world may know, . . . arise, let us go hence !*" This way of speaking is absolutely the same with that triumphant apostrophe of Jesus, which is preserved by the three Synoptics (Matt. ix. 6 and parallels) : "*That you may know . . . arise and walk !*"—*To arise* in order to go to Gethsemane was indeed to yield Himself voluntarily to the perfidy of Judas, who was to seek Him in that place well known by him, and to the power of Satan, who was preparing there for Jesus a last decisive conflict, the complement of that in the desert. Jesus knew well that they would not come to seize Him in the midst of the city, in the room where He was at this moment.

<sup>1</sup> Τουτου, in T. B., is founded only on some Mss. It.

<sup>2</sup> A E It<sup>sup</sup> omit καί.

<sup>3</sup> Instead of ενετειλατο, B L X It. Vulg. read εντολην εδωκεν.

The imperatives : *arise, let us go*, may not have been immediately followed by a result ; this is what *Meyer, Luthardt, Weiss, Keil* and *Reuss* think, who suppose that Jesus still remained in the room until after the sacerdotal prayer. They rest upon the *He went out* in xviii. 1, and on the solemn prayer of ch. xvii., which cannot have been made outside. We shall see that these reasons are not decisive. On the other hand, we do not understand why John should have mentioned so expressly the order to depart, if it had not been followed by a result ; or at least why did he not, in this case, indicate the delay by a word of explanation, as in xi. 6 ? *Gess* says rightly : “ Since Jesus, by the order of ver. 31, gave the signal for departing, we must represent to ourselves the following discourses, chs. xv., xvi., as uttered on the way to Gethsemane.”

*On the conversations in chap. xiv.*

The subject on which this chapter turns is indeed that which the situation calls for : the approaching separation. Jesus calms His disciples, who are profoundly troubled by this prospect, by promising them a twofold meeting again, the one more remote in the Father's house, at the end of their earthly career, the other altogether inward and spiritual, but very near. The historical fitness of these two great thoughts is perfect.—As to the questions of Thomas, Philip and Judas, *Reuss* finds that they proceed from such strange misunderstandings and such gross mistakes that it is impossible to accord to them any historical truthfulness. But exegesis has ascertained, on the contrary, that they are completely appropriate to the apostles' point of view at that moment. So long as Jesus was with them, notwithstanding their attachment to His person, they still shared in the ideas which were generally received. It was the death of their Master, His ascension, and finally Pentecost, which radically transformed their idea of the kingdom of God. There is, accordingly, nothing surprising in the fact that Thomas, like the Jews in ch. xii., should complain of understanding nothing about a Christ who leaves the earth ; or that Philip, like the Jews who demanded a sign from heaven, should, in place of His visible presence, ask for a sensible theophany ; or, finally, that Judas should ask anxiously what a Messianic coming could be of which the world should not be a witness. Two conceptions, that of the disciples and that of Jesus, do not cease to come into collision in these dialogues, and in order to have reproduced them so naturally and dramatically, at a period already advanced, when light had come on all these problems which at that moment occupied the disciples' minds, one must certainly have been present at these conversations, and have himself taken a lively part in them. This appears, moreover, from the manner in which the evangelist initiates us in this story into the intimate and familiar relations of Jesus with the disciples and the character of the personages who form the apostolic circle. Either all this—these proper names, these questions attributed to each one, these personal addresses of Jesus—is a play unworthy of a serious man, or it is the narrative of a witness who himself participated in the emotions of this last evening.

II. *The position of the Disciples in the world after the outpouring of the Spirit :*  
 xv. 1-xvi. 15.

Jesus had just promised to His own, in ch. xiv., the twofold reunion, heavenly and earthly, in which the separation should issue, the thought of which was now so greatly troubling them. In ch. xv. He transports Himself in thought to the epoch when the earthly and purely internal reunion shall be consummated through His spiritual return. The glorified Christ has returned and lives in His own. They are united to Him, and, through Him, among themselves. Under His impulse they work all together, like the members of one and the same body, in the Father's work. Such is the new position with a view to which He now gives them the necessary directions, warnings and encouragements. They are like the branches which crown a fruitful vine and offer to the world its savory fruits. But the world, instead of blessing them, will take the axe to destroy this noble plant of heaven. Its hatred, however, will have no other effect than to display the divine force which will sustain them and by means of which they will overcome the world. Thus there are three principal ideas : 1. The new condition of the disciples after the return of Jesus through the Holy Spirit : xv. 1-17 ; 2. The hostility of the world to this new society : xv. 18-xvi. 4 ; 3. The spiritual victory which the Holy Spirit will gain over the world by their means : xvi. 5-15. The three personages of this coming drama : the disciples, the world, the Holy Spirit. Each one of them is successively predominant in one of the three parts of the following discourse.

1. xv. 1-17.

After the words : "Let us go hence," Jesus and the disciples left the room which had just been to them, as it were, the vestibule of the Father's house. Whither do they go ? According to *Westcott* : to the temple, which was open during the nights of the Passover feast. There was suspended the well-known golden vine which suggests to Jesus to represent Himself in the figure developed at the beginning of the following discourse. There is nothing less probable, as it seems to me, than this hypothesis. Why should not John have indicated this locality as he has always done, and how in a place like this could Jesus have found a sufficiently solitary spot for His last conversations and His last prayer ? We imagine Jesus and the apostles rather as silently traversing the streets of Jerusalem, and soon finding on the slope which descends into the valley of Cedron a retired spot where they stop. Surrounded by this little circle of disciples, in view of Jerusalem and the Jewish people now assembled in that city, Jesus contemplates the immense task which awaits His disciples as those who are to continue His work. Transporting Himself in thought to the moment when His spiritual return will be consummated, He endeavors first of all to make them comprehend the nature of this situation which is so new for them, and the obligations which will spring from it. And first, the *position*, vv. 1-3 (*in me*) ; then the *duty* of this position, ver. 4 (*to abide in me*) ;

finally, the consequences of this duty fulfilled or not fulfilled, vv. 5-8 (to bear fruit or to burn).

Vv. 1-3. "I am the true vine, and my Father is the vine-dresser. 2. Every branch in me which bears not fruit, he takes away; and every branch which bears fruit he prunes, that it may bear more fruit. 3. As for you, you are already clean because of the word which I have spoken to you."—The pronoun ἐγώ, I, placed at the beginning, and the epithet ἡ ἀληθινή, the real vine, lead us naturally to suppose that Jesus wishes to establish a contrast here between His person and any vine whatsoever which is not in His view the true vine. What outward circumstance leads Jesus to express Himself in this way? Those who hold that Jesus has not yet gone out of the room, or give up the attempt to resolve the question (*de Wette*), either have recourse to the use of the vine in the institution of the Holy Supper (*Grotius, Meyer*), or suppose that Jesus pointed the disciples to the shoots of a vine which projected into the room (*Knapp, Tholuck*), or even that He was thinking of the golden vine which adorned one of the gates of the temple (*Jerome, Lampe; see Westcott*). *Hengstenberg, Weiss and Keil* think that Jesus wishes to contrast His Church with Israel, which is so often represented under the figure of a vine, in the Old Testament (Is. v. 1 ff., Ps. lxxx. 9 ff.). But the continuation of the figure (*branches, fruits, pruning, burning, etc.*) shows that it is not a symbolic vine which occupies His thought. If we hold that when uttering the words of xiv. 31, Jesus has really gone out from the room and the city, the explanation becomes very simple. On the way to Gethsemane, Jesus stops before a vine covered with branches; He looks upon His disciples grouped about Him, and finds in this plant the emblem of His relation to them. What significance has the objection of *Weiss* that any other plant might have served Him as a symbol? It was this plant which was there; and it offered Him points of agreement which no other presented to Him. Among all the plants, the vine has certainly a special dignity resulting from the nobleness of its sap and the excellence of its fruits; this is what explains the use which the Old Testament makes of it as a figure of Israel, the noblest of the nations.

The word *vine* includes here the stock and the branches, as the term ὁ χριστός, 1 Cor. xii. 12, designates Christ and the Church. The point of comparison between Christ and the vine is the organic union by which the life of the trunk becomes that of the branches. As the sap which resides in the branches is that which they derive from the vine, the life in the disciples will be that which they will draw from Jesus as glorified. God is compared to the *vine-dresser* because it is He who, by the sending of Jesus, has founded the Church, who possesses it and cultivates it, without by His dispensations, within by His Spirit. Jesus means thereby to make them appreciate the value of this plant which God Himself has planted, and for which He, in such a personal way, has a care. What is said here does not preclude the fact that God accomplishes this work by the intermediate agency of Jesus as glorified. Only the figure does not allow this aspect of the truth to be noticed; for Jesus is here compared to the vine itself, and it is in the relation of His *unity* with His own that He appears in this

parable. In the remarkable words of Eph. i. 22, Paul has found the means of uniting this twofold relation : Jesus one with the Church ; Jesus protecting and governing the Church.—The culture of the vine includes two principal operations : the purification of the *vine* and the purification of the *branches*. The first is that by which every *sterile branch* is cut off (the *αἰπεῖν*) ; the second, that by which the fruitful branches are pruned, that is to say, are freed from *useless shoots*, in order that the sap may be concentrated in the cluster which is forming (the *καθαίπεῖν*). As the question in this passage is only of the relation of Jesus to the members of His community, apparent or real, the first of these images cannot be applied, as *Hengstenberg* has applied them, to the rejection of unbelieving Israel. If an example is presented to the view of Jesus, it can only be that of Judas and of those disciples who, in ch. vi., had broken the bond which united them to Him. In any case, He is thinking of the future of His Church ; He sees beforehand those professors of the Gospel, who, while being outwardly united to Him, will nevertheless live inwardly separated from Him, whether in consequence of a decree which will prevent them from being truly converted, or as the effect of their neglecting to sacrifice even to the uttermost their own life and to renew daily their union with Him.—'Εν ἐμοί, *in me*, may refer to the word *branch* : *every branch in me*, united with me by the profession of faith ; or to the participle *φέρων* : *which does not bear fruit in me*. By *fruit* Jesus designates the production and development of the *spiritual* life, with all its normal manifestations, either in ourselves or in others, through the strength of Christ living in us (Rom. i. 13). It may happen that the believer, after a time of fervor, may allow his own life to regain the ascendancy over that which he derives from the Lord, and that the latter may be about to perish. Then the pruning-knife of the vine-dresser intervenes. After having for a time tolerated this dead member in the Church, God, by a temptation to which He subjects him, or by an outward dispensation which separates him from the surroundings in which he was, or by the stroke of death, severs him externally from the community of believers with which only an apparent bond connected him.

The second operation, the purification of the *branches*, has in view the true believers who really live in Christ through the Holy Spirit. It is intended to cut off all the shoots of their own life which may manifest themselves in them, and which would paralyze the power of the Spirit. Ver. 3 will show that it is the divine word which properly has the mission of pruning these shoots ; but if this means is not employed or is not sufficient, God makes use of other more grievous instruments, which, like a well-sharpened pruning knife, cut to the quick the natural affections and the carnal will (1 Cor. xi. 30-32). In this way the whole being of the disciple is finally devoted to the production of the divine fruit.

In ver. 3 Jesus declares to the disciples that He ranks them in the second class of branches, and no longer in the first. The work of *pruning* alone concerns them, and even, in principle, it is already accomplished in them. By receiving Christ and the word which He has declared to them, " they have given the death-blow to the old man " (*Gess*), even though he has yet

to die. By the moral education which they have received from Jesus, the principle of perfect purity has been deposited in them. For the word of Christ is the instrument of a daily judgment, of a constant and austere discipline which God exercises on the soul which remains attached to Him. On this part attributed to the word of Jesus, comp. v. 24, viii. 31, 32, xii. 48.—*Διά* (with the accusative) not *by*, but *because of*.—*ὑμεῖς* : *you*, in opposition to all those who are not yet in this privileged position.—From the nature of this position (*in me*) Jesus infers the *duty* of the position : *to abide in Him*.

Ver. 4. "*Abide in me, and I in you ; as the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, unless it abides<sup>1</sup> in the vine, no more can you, unless you abide<sup>2</sup> in me.*—To continue in the vine is for a branch the condition of life, and consequently its only law. All the conditions of fruitfulness are included in this. The imperative proves that one abides in this relation, as one enters it, *freely*, by the faithful use of the divinely offered methods. Ver. 7 will show that the fundamental means is the word of Jesus.—*Ἐν ἐμοὶ μένειν, to abide in me*, expresses the continual act by which the Christian sets aside everything which he might derive from his own wisdom, strength, merit, to draw all from Christ, in these different relations, through the deep longings of faith. This condition is so completely the only one laid down for the action of the force of Christ in him, that in the following clause Jesus omits the verb—although it would properly be necessary for another person and at another time (*I will abide*)—as if to make them feel that this act on His part is an immediate and necessary consequence of the act demanded of the believer ; where the latter is accomplished, the former cannot fail to be realized. In this way, the action of Christ, no less than our own, is boldly placed under the control of our freedom. It is naturally on this second fact (*I in you*), of which the first : *You in me*, is only the condition, that the fruitfulness of the branch directly depends.

Hence the end of ver. 4 ; the duty imposed on the believer results from the immediate unfruitfulness with which his separation from the vine would affect him as a branch. Here, as in ver. 19, *ἐὰν μὴ* is an explanation of *ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ*, and not a limitation applied to the whole preceding idea : "by himself, *that is to say*, if he does not abide. . . ."—The theme here formulated is not that of the moral powerlessness of the natural man for any good ; it is that of the unfruitfulness of the believer left to his own strength, when the question is of producing or advancing the spiritual life, the life of God, in himself or in others.

After having described the new position and the law which it imposes, Jesus sets forth in the following verses, 5-8, the *sanction* of this law of life and death which He has just declared. And first, in ver. 5, the glorious results which the fruitful branch will obtain and the opposite result of unfaithfulness.

Ver. 5. "*I am the vine, you are the branches ; he who abides in me and I in him, this one bears much fruit ; for apart from me, you can do nothing.*"—

<sup>1</sup> N B L : *μενη* instead of *μενην* (T. R. with 14 Mjj).

<sup>2</sup> N A B L : *μενητε* instead of *μενητε* which T. R. reads with 13 Mjj.

Jesus begins by summarily reaffirming the nature of the relation. While contemplating the natural vine which He has before His eyes, He recognizes in it the image of the complete dependence on Him in which His disciples are: "Yes, here indeed is what I am to you and what you are to me: I, the vine; you, the branches! Do not therefore allow yourselves ever to fall into the temptation of making yourselves the vine, by desiring to derive anything from yourselves." The meaning is, therefore: "In me, rich fruitfulness; apart from me, barrenness." If this second idea is given as a proof of the first (*ὅτι, because*), it appears at the first glance scarcely logical. But if Christ is so completely *everything* that the believer can do nothing without Him, does it not follow that the latter can do *much*, so long as he shall remain united with Him?—Then, in ver. 6, the fate of the branch which has become unfruitful, and in vv. 7, 8, the fate of the branch united with Christ and fruitful in Him.

Ver. 6. "If any one abides<sup>1</sup> not in me, he is cast forth as the branch, and is withered; then they gather these branches,<sup>2</sup> they throw them into the fire, and they burn."—It was in Palestine precisely the season of the vine-dressing; perhaps, as *Lange* observes, Jesus had before His eyes at this very moment the fires which were consuming the branches recently cut off.—The threatening of ver. 6 cannot be referred to the Jewish nation and its destruction by the Romans, as *Hengstenberg* has asserted. Jesus is thinking of the unfaithful believer; it is a warning which the disciples should recall to mind after they had received the gifts of Pentecost.—The arists *ἔβληθη*, has been cast forth (out of the vine), *ἐξηράθη*, has been withered, are explained, according to *Bäumlein*, as in the numerous cases where this tense serves to designate a truth of daily experience. *Meyer* thinks rather that Jesus transports Himself in thought to the time when the judgment shall have been already pronounced. Is it not more simple to suppose that the punishment is so regarded as forming only one thing with the fault (not abiding), that it seems already accomplished in it?—As subject of *συνάγουσι*, they gather, we must understand the servants of the vine-dresser; in the application, the angels (Luke xii. 20, Matt. xiii. 41).—The *fire*, emblem of the judgment; comp. another image in Luke xiv. 34, 35.—*Καίεται*, they burn, the present of duration takes here its full force. The thought remains suspended in view of this fire which burns, and burns always.—It appears clearly from Ezek. xv. 5 that the wood of the vine, when once cut, was regarded as no longer able to serve any use except for burning. Hence the expression of *Augustine*: *aut vitis, aut ignis*.—Vv. 7, 8 describe the glorious results of the perseverance of the believer in the communion with Christ.

Vv. 7, 8. "If you abide in me and my words abide in you, ask<sup>3</sup> what you will, and it shall be done for you. 8. Herein is my Father glorified, that you bear much fruit, and so you shall become<sup>4</sup> my disciples."—The parallelism

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  A B D : *μην* instead of *μειν*.

<sup>2</sup> D L X Δ H 20 Mnn. It<sup>all</sup> Syr. : *αυτο* (it) instead of *αυτα* (them).

<sup>3</sup> A B D L M X Γ 50 Mnn. It<sup>all</sup> : *αιτησασθε* (*ask*), instead of *αιτησεσθε* (*you shall ask*), which

T. R. reads with  $\aleph$  and 11 other Mjj., etc.

<sup>4</sup> B D L M N Δ : *γενησθε* (*that you become*), instead of *γενησεσθε* (*you shall become*), which T. R. reads with  $\aleph$  A and 9 Mjj.

between the two conditions indicated, ver. 7, would lead us to expect as the form of the second the words: "And I abide in you" rather than: "And *my words* abide in you." Jesus wishes to make known to His own by this change of expression, that it is the constant remembrance of and habitual meditation upon His words, which is the condition on which He will be able continually to make His strength dwell in them and act through them. In this relation, the disciple will not begin by acting, but simply by *asking*. For he knows that it is the divine strength thus obtained which must do everything. The words of Jesus, meditatively considered, become in the believer the food for holy thoughts and pious purposes, heavenly aspirations, and thereby the source of true prayers. While meditating on them, he comprehends the work of God; he measures its depth and height, its length and breadth, and fervently asks for the advancement of that work in the definite form which answers to the present needs. A prayer thus formed is the child of heaven; it is the promise of God (the word of Jesus) transformed into supplication; in this condition the hearing of it is certain and the promise which is so absolute: *It shall be done for you*, has no longer anything that surprises us.—The Alexandrian authorities read the imperative *ask*, the others the future *you shall ask*. The first has more liveliness.

The result of this fruitfulness of the disciples will be the glorification of the Father (ver. 8). What is there that honors the vine-dresser more than the extraordinary productiveness of the vine to which he has with partiality given his care? Now, the vine-dresser is the Father (ver. 1). The *ἐν τούτῳ*, *herein*, refers evidently to the *ὡς*, *in order that* or *that*, which follows; this conjunction here takes the place of *ὅτι*, because the idea of bearing fruit presents itself to the mind as an *end* to be attained.—The aorist *ἐδοξάσθη*, properly *has been glorified*, characterizes this result as immediately gained at the moment when the condition, the production of fruit, is realized. *Winer* and others prefer to see in this aorist an anticipation of the final result.—While contemplating with filial satisfaction the glory of His Father, which will result from time to time from the activity of the disciples, Jesus seems to press to His heart these precious beings with a redoubled affection. They will thus continue the work of their Master, who has only thought of glorifying the Father, and will deserve more and more the title of *His disciples*. *Καί*: *and thus*. Instead of the future *and you shall become*, the Alexandrian authorities read the subjunctive: *and that you may become* (*γένησθε*, dependent on *ὡς*). *Tischendorf* himself rejects this reading, which is only a correction after *φέρετε*.—The dative *ἐμοί* is more pressing and more tender than the genitive *ἐμοῦ* would be: "You will belong to me more closely as my disciples." One must always *become* a disciple; one *is* not such once for all.—As the vine does not itself bear any cluster, and offers its fruits to the world only through the medium of the branches, so Jesus will diffuse spiritual life here on earth only through the instrumentality of those who shall have received it from Him. In forming a Church, He creates for Himself a body for the pouring forth of His life and for the glorification of God on the earth. The vine keeps itself in the background in this great work, that it may only

allow the branches to appear ; it is for them, in their turn, to put themselves in the background, that they may render homage to the vine for all which they effect. The epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians set forth, in a completely original form, this same relation between Christ and believers. The figures of the *head* and *body* correspond absolutely, in these letters, to those of the vine and the branch in this passage. When Paul says of the glorified Christ “*that all the fulness of the Deity dwells bodily in him,*” and “*that we have all fulness in him,*” he only formulates the meaning of the parable of the vine and the branch, as it has just presented itself to us. And this also explains why the propagation of the spiritual life advances so slowly in humanity. The vine effects nothing except through the branches ; and these too often paralyze the action of the vine, instead of propagating it !

The condition for abiding in Christ is to remain under the action of His word (ver. 7) in the enjoyment of His love, and this latter depends on obedience to His commandments, and especially to that of brotherly love: vv. 9-17.

Vv. 9-11. “*As the Father has loved me, I also have loved you ; abide in my love. 10. If you keep my commandments, you shall abide in my love,<sup>1</sup> as I have<sup>2</sup> kept my Father’s commandments and abide in His love. 11. I have spoken this to you that my joy may be<sup>3</sup> in you and that your joy may be fulfilled.*”—It is the love of Jesus which has formed the bond between Him and ourselves. In this love has the stream of the divine love burst forth on the earth ; first, the love of the Father for Jesus, of which He gave Him the assurance at the baptism, and which is that with which He loved Him before His incarnation (xvii. 24) ; then, the love of Jesus for His own, which is of the same nature as that of God for Him (καθώς, not ὡσπερ). The initiative in these two cases comes from the more exalted being. What then is the condition to the end that the relation may be maintained and strengthened ? It is simply necessary that the inferior being should accept this love and respond to it. He has not to awaken it ; he has only to abide under its beams. But in order to this, he must not force it to turn away from him ; and this is what he will do by unfaithfulness and disobedience. Jesus calls attention to the fact that He does not here impose on the believer with reference to Himself any other condition than that to which He has Himself submitted with reference to the Father. His life was an act of permanent submission to the divine injunctions ; without this submission, he would have ceased instantly to be the object of the satisfied love of the Father (viii. 29, x. 17). Such is also the position of the believer with regard to the love of Christ. The expression *my love* can designate here only the love of Jesus for His own ; comp. the words : *As I have loved you*, and the whole development in vv. 13-16. The Lord uses with reference to Himself the verbs in the past because He has reached the end of His earthly life. The second clause of ver. 9 : *and I have loved you*, does not depend on καθώς, as : “*As my Father has*

<sup>1</sup> Σ omits the words εαν . . . εν τη αγαπη μου (confusion with ver. 29).

<sup>3</sup> A B D It. Vulg. read η (may be) instead of μεινη (may abide).

<sup>2</sup> Σ D It. : εγω instead of καγω.

loved me *and as* I have loved you." For the principal verb, which would, in that case, be : *abide*, is not in any logical relation to the first clause of ver. 9 : *as my Father has loved me*. The meaning is : "And I also, I have loved you ; continue therefore the objects of this love."—And how so ? By faithfulness to His injunctions like to that which He Himself testifies with reference to the will of the Father (ver. 10).—In demanding this of them Jesus is assured by His own experience that He is not imposing on them a burden, but rather is revealing to them the secret of perfect joy (ver. 11). It is this constant rejoicing in the love of the Father in the path of obedience which has constituted His own joy here on earth ; and this joy will be reproduced in His disciples in the same path. It is then, indeed, *His joy* into which He initiates them and to the possession of which He invites them in these words : "*I have said this to you* in order that . . ." *My joy* cannot therefore here signify : the joy which I will produce in you (*Calvin*) ; or the joy which I feel on your account (*Augustine*) ; or the joy which you feel on my account (*Euthymius*). The question is of the joy with which He Himself rejoices in feeling Himself to be the object of the Father's love. Comp. the analogous expression *my peace*, xiv. 27.—Thus through obedience their joy will increase even to fulness. For every act of fidelity will draw closer the bond between Jesus and themselves, as every moment in the life of Jesus drew closer the bond between Him and His Father. And to feel oneself included with the Son in the Father's love—is not this *perfect joy* ? The reading  $\eta$  seems preferable to  $\mu\epsilon\iota\nu\eta$ . The notion of *being* is sufficient ; that of *abiding* would be superfluous ; comp. xvii. 26.

Ver. 12. "*This is my commandment, that you love one another as I have loved you.*"—Comp. xiii. 34. This is the normal relation of the branches to one another, which has as its condition the normal relation of each one to the vine. So *Hengstenberg* finds in vv. 1-11 the *résumé* of the first part of the summary of the law, and in vv. 12-17, that of the second.—In vv. 13-16, Jesus raises the mutual love of His own to its full height by giving as a model for it that which He has had for them. These four verses are the commentary on the word *as* in the words : "*As I have loved you.*" And first, ver. 13 : the point to which His love has carried devotion—death ; then, vv. 14, 15 : the character of full intimacy which He has given to this relation of love ; it was the confidence of the friend rather than the authority of the master ; finally, ver. 16 : the free initiative with which He has Himself laid the foundation of this relation. The meaning of this whole development is this : "When therefore you ask yourselves what limits are to be set to your mutual love, begin by asking yourselves, what limits, in these various points, that love which I have had for you has set for itself !" Or : "And when you would know what it is to love, look at me !" (*Gess*).

Ver. 13. "*No one has greater love than this, that a man<sup>1</sup> lay down his life for his friends.*"—In the relation to *friends*, there is no greater proof of love than the sacrifice of one's life on their behalf. There is undoubtedly a greater proof of love, *absolutely speaking*,—it is to sacrifice it for enemies,

<sup>1</sup>  $\delta$  D It. omit  $\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  after  $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha$ .

Rom. v. 6-8. "Iva keeps the idea of aim : "the highest point to which love, in this relation of friends, can *aspire* to raise itself."

Vv. 14, 15. "You are my friends, if you do whatsoever<sup>1</sup> I command you. 15. I call you no longer servants, because the servant knows not what his master does ; but I have named you friends, because I have made known to you all things which I have heard from my Father."—In ver. 14, the emphasis is, not on the condition : *If you do*, . . . but on the affirmation : *You are my friends* ; Jesus means : "It is not without reason that I have just said : *for his friends* (ver. 13), for this is indeed the relation which I have formed with you and which will be maintained if you show yourselves obedient and faithful." What more touching than a master who, finding a servant really faithful, gives him in the house the rank and title of friend !

Ver. 15 serves to prove the *reality* of this position of friends which He has given them. He has shown an unbounded confidence in them by initiating them unreservedly into the communications which His Father made to Him with relation to the great work in which He had called them to labor with Him. The master employs his slave without explaining to him what he intends to do. Jesus has communicated to them the whole thought of God with regard to the salvation in which they are to co-operate. No doubt there remain yet many things to teach them (xvi. 12). But, if He has not yet revealed these to them, it is not from a want of confidence and love ; it is in order to spare their weakness and because only another can discharge this task. It has been objected to this οὐκέτι ("I no longer call you"), that the address *my friends* is found in Luke xii. 4, much earlier than the present moment ; as if the tendency to make them His friends had not existed in Him from the beginning, and must not have manifested itself already on certain occasions ! It has also been objected that the apostles continue to call themselves *servants of Jesus Christ* ; as if, although it pleases the master to make the servant his friend, the latter were not so much the more bound to remind himself and others of his natural condition !

Ver. 16. "You have not chosen me ; but I have chosen you and appointed you, that you should go and bear fruit, and that your fruit should remain ; that, whatsoever you may ask the Father in my name, he may give<sup>2</sup> it you."—The very origin of the relation thus formed between them depends only on Him. Jesus has the consciousness of the greatness of the proof of love which He has given them by associating them of *His own impulse* in that work which constitutes the highest activity of which man can be judged worthy. By the term : *I have chosen you*, He alludes, as in vi. 70 and xiii. 18, to the solemn act of their election to the apostleship, related in Luke vi. 12 ff. The word ἐθῆκα, *have appointed*, designates their gradual installation into this office, as well as their spiritual education, for which He had labored with so much perseverance.—The expression *ἵνα ὑμεῖς ἵνα*, *that you should go*, refers to their apostolic mission in the world, and sets forth the relative independence which they will

<sup>1</sup> The MSS. read either ο (B It<sup>all</sup>) or α (N D L X It<sup>all</sup> Vulg. Cop.), or with T. R. οσα (13 Mj). Min. Syr).

<sup>2</sup> Instead of ἵνα ο τι αν and δω (or δωη), N reads οτι αν and δωσει.

enjoy as they take His place in this task.—The *fruit* designates here, more specially than in ver. 2, the communication to other men of the spiritual life which they themselves possess. This fruit does not perish, as that of earthly labor does : *it remains*.—The second *iva*, *in order that*, cannot be dependent on the first, as *Hengstenberg*, *Luthardt* and *Keil* would have it, as if Jesus meant that they would go and bear fruit in order that, being thus in communion with the Father, they might be heard by Him. This thought is unnatural. The second *in order that* is simply co-ordinate with the preceding, as in xiii. 34 ; comp. as to the substance and form, the two clauses dependent on *ὅτι*, xiv. 12, 13. Jesus reminds them that the very efficacy of their labor will be due to the revelation which He has given them of His person and the prayer which will result from it, the prayer in His name. Thus, through their dependence on the verb : *I have appointed you*, these words mean : “And you are now, through my name which you know, in the glorious position of gaining for yourselves directly from the Father whatsoever you will have to ask from Him.” All this as the fruit of the free initiative of His love towards them.

Ver. 17. “*I give you these precepts, that you may love one another.*”—The pronoun *ταῦτα* cannot refer to the *iva* which follows : “I command you *this*, that you love one another.” For the plural proves that this expression includes all the preceding instructions and suggestions since xv. 1, particularly the words of vv. 12-16. The *iva* must therefore be translated by *in order that* ; it indicates, in conformity with the idea of ver. 12, the purpose of these injunctions.—This work is all love ; love in its first origin, the love of the Father ; love in its great manifestation, the love of Christ ; finally, love in its end, the full flowering of mutual love among believers. Love is its root, its trunk and its fruit. This is the essential characteristic of the new kingdom, whose power and conquests are due only to the contagion of love. This is the reason why Jesus leaves no other law than that of love to those who, through faith, have become members of His body.

*Luthardt* observes that in the first seventeen verses of this chapter, there is found only one particle of connection. This long *asyndeton* has an especial solemnity. Here is the last wish of Jesus speaking to His own (see xvii. 24).—Such a style could not belong to a Greek author ; these words came forth from Hebrew thought.

## 2. xv. 18-xvi. 4.

Opposite to this spiritual body whose inward life and outward activity He has just described, Jesus sees a hostile society arise, which has also its principle of unity, hatred of Christ and of God : *the world*, natural humanity, which will declare war against the Church, and which is represented at this moment by the Jewish people. Jesus draws a first picture of its hatred to believers, vv. 18-25. Then, after having pointed out in passing, as if to reassure the disciples, the succor which will be given them, He reproduces with still more living colors the description of the hostility of the world, ver. 26-xvi. 4.

Vv. 18-20. “*If the world hates you, know that I have been the object of its*

hatred before you.<sup>1</sup> 19. *If you were of the world, the world would love what belongs to it; but because you are not of the world and I have drawn you out of the world, therefore the world hates you.* 20. *Remember the word which I have said to you:<sup>2</sup> the servant is not greater than his master; if they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you; if they have kept my word, they will keep yours also.*—Jesus does not wish merely to announce to His disciples the hatred of which they are going to be the object on the part of the world; He wishes to fortify them against it; and He does so by saying to them, first: it will hate you *as me* (vv. 18–20); then: it will hate you *because of me* (vv. 21–25). Nothing makes us more ready to suffer as Christians than the thought that there happens to us only what happened to Christ, and that it happens to us *for* Him. Γινώσκετε may be taken as an imperative, like μνημονεύετε (*remember*), ver. 20: “Consider what has happened with regard to me, and you will understand that everything which happens to you is in the natural order.” The indicative sense, however, is more simple: “If a similar experience befalls you, *you know* the explanation of it already: you know indeed that. . . .”—By their union with Christ, the disciples represent henceforth on earth a principle foreign to humanity which lives apart from God, *to the world*. This manifestation therefore appears strange to the world; it is offended by it; it will seek to get rid of it.—Ἐξελεξάμην, *I have chosen*, indicates here the call to faith, not to the apostleship; by this word *to choose* Jesus would designate the act by which He has drawn them to Himself and detached them from the world; the thought of divine predestination is not found here, any more than in ver. 16. The close relation formed by this act of Jesus between Himself and the disciples is formulated in ver. 20 by the expressions *master* and *servant*. The quoted axiom has the same sense as in Matt. x. 24, but a different sense from John xiii. 16. In ch. xiii. it is an encouragement to humility; here it is an encouragement to patience.—It is natural to regard the two cases set forth by Jesus in ver. 20 as both real. The *mass* of the people will no more be converted by the preaching of the apostles than by that of Jesus. But as Jesus has had the satisfaction of rescuing isolated *individuals* from ruin, this joy will also be granted to the disciples. This meaning seems to me preferable to that of *Grotius*, who gives to the second clause an ironical sense, or to that of *Bengel*, who takes τηρεῖν, *to keep*, in the sense of maliciously watching, or, finally, to the interpretation of *Lücke, Meyer, de Wette, Hengstenberg, Weiss*, who see in the two sides of the alternative proposed only two abstract propositions between which the apostles can easily decide which one will be realized for them; as if Jesus and themselves had not also gained some of the members of the κόσμος.

Vv. 21–25. “*But they will do all this to you<sup>3</sup> for my name's sake, because they know not him who sent me.* 22. *If I had not come and spoken to them, they would not have had sin; but now they have no excuse for their sin.* 23. *He who hates me, hates my Father also.* 24. *If I had not done among them works*

<sup>1</sup> N D I<sup>plerique</sup> omit ὑμῶν (you).

<sup>2</sup> B D L I<sup>ultra</sup> Syr.: εἰς ἡμᾶς instead of ὑμῶν.

<sup>3</sup> Instead of του λογου ου εγω ειπον, N reads \* N omits this word.  
του λογου ον, D: τους λογους ους ελαλησα.

such as no other has done,<sup>1</sup> they would not have had sin ; but now they have seen, and nevertheless have hated both me and my Father. 25. But this is so, that the word may be fulfilled, which is written in their law : They hated me without a cause.—The apostles should not be disturbed because of this so general hatred, imagining that they have themselves provoked it, and believing that they see in it the proof that they are on a wrong path : “ But (ἀλλά) take courage ; it is because of me.”—“ Because of my name,” says Jesus ; that is, because of the revelation of my person which you have received, and which you will declare to them.—The reason why this revelation, which should make Israel rejoice, will exasperate that people, is that they *do not* truly know God. The idea of God has been perverted in the heart of this people. This is the reason why they are offended at the appearance of Jesus, and will be offended at the preaching of His apostles. The book of the Gospels is the setting forth of the first of these facts, and the book of the Acts that of the second. In consequence of their blindness, Israel will rather see in the holiest man an impostor than the one sent from God.

Ver. 22. This blindness which has prevailed in their entire history (see the discourse of Stephen, Acts vii.) might have still been forgiven them, if, at this decisive moment, they had finally yielded. But the rejection of this supreme divine manifestation characterizes their state as an invincible antipathy, as the hatred of God, a sentiment which constitutes the unpardonable sin. Some (Beugel, Luthardt, Lange, Hengstenberg, Keil) think that the sin which would not have been imputed to them is their very *unbelief* with reference to Jesus. But this sin, if Jesus had not come, would not have been even possible (Weiss). It would be necessary, therefore, to understand the first words in this sense : “ If I had not come in such or such a way, for example, with the holiness which I have displayed, and had not borne witness for myself in so convincing a manner.” But Jesus simply says : If I had not *come*—that is, as Messiah. The meaning, therefore, is this : “ The former sin of Israel, its long resistance to God, would have been forgiven it, if it had not now crowned all by the rejection of Jesus as He *came* as Saviour, and bore testimony to Himself as such.” This last sin destroys all the excuses which Israel could have alleged for its conduct in general ; it proves incontestably that this people is animated by an ill-will towards God ; that it does not sin through ignorance. The idea is not altogether the same as in ix. 41.

Ver. 23. In the rejection of Jesus there is hatred towards Him, and in this hatred towards Him, the Jewish malignity reveals itself clearly as *hatred of God* : it is distinguished thereby from a mere ignorance, like that of the heathen. More than this :

Ver. 24. If the testimony which Jesus bore to Himself did not succeed in enlightening them, His works ought at least to have procured credence for His testimony. The one who did not have a consciousness sufficiently developed to apprehend the divine character of His teachings, had at least eyes to behold His miracles.—For the first two καί, see vi. 36 : they have caused

<sup>1</sup> The MSS. are divided between ποιηκεν (T. R. with E G H etc.) and εποιησεν (S A B D etc.).

things which seemed incompatible to move together : *seeing and hating* ; and this at once (the two following *kai*) with reference to me and my Father: these last two *kai* are additive, not adversative.

Ver. 25. Ἀλλά : “ *But* there is nothing astonishing in this.” The righteous man of the old covenant had already complained by the mouth of David (Ps. xxxv. 19, lxix. 5) of being the object of the *gratuitous* hatred of the enemies of God. If their hatred was wholly laid to their own charge, notwithstanding the faults of the imperfectly righteous man, with how much stronger reason can the perfectly righteous One appropriate to Himself this complaint, which is, at the same time, His consolation and that of those who suffer like Him and for Him !—Weiss asserts here, as with reference to the other quotations of this kind, that the evangelist puts in the mouth of even the Messiah these words of the Old Testament. The evangelist would then imagine the Messiah as also uttering these words of ver. 6 from Ps. lxix : O God, Thou knowest my foolishness, and my sins are not hid from Thee ; or he could never have read them ! As for Ps. xxxv., it is impossible to find in it a line which could have led any reader whatever of the Old Testament to the Messianic application.—*In order that* depends on a “ This has happened,” or “ This must have happened,” understood, as in so many other cases (ix. 3, xiii. 18, 1 John ii. 19, Mark xiv. 49, etc.). On the term “ *their law*,” see on viii. 17. De Wette finds irony in these words : “ They practise faithfully their law.” This meaning seems far-fetched.

Vv. 26, 27. “ *But* when they shall have come, whom I will send you from the Father, the Spirit of truth who proceeds from the Father, he shall testify of me ; 27. and you also shall testify, because you are with me from the beginning.”—Weiss sees in this intervention of the Spirit’s testimony a fact which Jesus alleges in order to demonstrate the truth of the word *without cause*, ver 25. But this connection is unnatural ; it would have required a γάρ in ver. 26. It is more simple to suppose that, in speaking of the hatred of the world, Jesus interrupts Himself for a moment in order to show immediately to the disciples the power which will sustain them in this terrible conflict. He only indicates this help for a moment in passing. The idea will be completely developed in the following passage, xvi. 5–15, when the picture of Jewish hostility will be finished.—In saying : *whom I will send*, Jesus is necessarily thinking of His approaching reinstatement in the divine condition ; and in adding : *from the Father*, He acknowledges His subordination to the Father, even when He shall have recovered that condition.—Jesus here designates the Spirit as *Spirit of truth*, in order to place Him in opposition to the falsehood of the world, to its voluntary ignorance. The Spirit will dissipate the darkness in which it tries to envelop itself.—Most of the modern interpreters, Meyer, Luthardt, Weiss, Keil, refer the words : *who proceeds from the Father*, to the same fact as the preceding words : *whom I will send you from the Father*,—to the sending of the Holy Spirit to the disciples. The attempt is made to escape the charge of tautology by saying that the first clause indicates the relation of

<sup>1</sup> Ἄ Ἐ Δ omit δε after οταν.

the Spirit to Christ, and the second His relation to God (*Keil*) ; as if in this latter were not already contained the *from God*, which, repeated in the second clause, would form the most idle pleonasm. It must be observed that the second verb differs entirely from the first ; *ἐκπορεύεσθαι*, *to proceed from*, as a river from its source, is altogether different from *to be sent* : the *ἐκ*, *out from*, which is added here to *παρά*, *from the presence of*, also marks a difference. But especially does the change of tense indicate the difference of idea : whom *I will send* and *who proceeds from*. He whom Jesus will send (historically, at a given moment) is a divine being, who emanates (essentially, eternally) from the Father. An impartial exegesis cannot, as it seems to me, deny this sense. It is that the historical facts of salvation, to the view of Jesus, rest upon eternal relations, as well with reference to Himself, the Son, as to the Spirit. They are, as it were, the reflections of the Trinitarian relations. As the incarnation of the Son rests upon His eternal generation, so the *mission* of the Holy Spirit is related to His eternal *procession* from the very centre of the divine being. The context is not in the least contradictory to this sense, as *Weiss* thinks ; on the contrary, it demands it. What Jesus sends testifies truly for Him only so far as it comes forth from God.—The Latin church is not wrong, therefore, in affirming the *Filioque*, starting from the words : *I will send*, and the Greek church is no more wrong in maintaining the *per Filium* and subordination, starting from the words : *from the Father*. In order to bring these two views into accord, we must place ourselves at the Christological point of view of the Gospel of John, according to which the homoousia and the subordination are simultaneously true.—The pronoun *ἐκεῖνος*, “*he*, that being, and he alone,” sums up all the characteristics which have just been attributed to the Holy Spirit, and makes prominent the unique authority of this divine witness.—Does this testimony given to the person of Jesus consist only in the *presence* of the Spirit on the earth, as proof *de facto* of His glorification ? This sense would not suit either the name *support* nor that of Spirit *of truth*, and would not account for the pronoun *you*, in the promise : “*I will send to you*.” The question here is rather of the testimony given before the world, in answer to its hostile attitude, by the intermediate agency of the apostles ; for example, by the mouth of Peter and the one hundred and twenty on the day of Pentecost.—But if it is so, we ask ourselves how can Jesus afterwards distinguish this testimony from that of the apostles themselves, in ver. 27 : *And you also shall bear witness for me* ; and the more, since the particle *καὶ δέ* indicates a marked gradation (comp. vi. 51) ; *καί*, *and also* ; *δέ*, *and besides*. To understand the distinction, we must begin with ver. 27, which is the simplest one. The apostles possess a treasure which is peculiar to them, and which the Spirit could not communicate to them—the *historical* knowledge of the ministry of Jesus from its beginning to its end. The Spirit does not teach the facts of history ; He reveals their meaning. But this historical testimony of the apostles would, without the Spirit, be only a frigid narrative incapable of creating life. It is the Spirit which brings the vivifying breath to the testimony. By making the light of the divine thought fall upon the facts, He makes them a power

which lays hold upon souls. Without the facts, the Spirit would be only an empty exaltation devoid of contents, of substance ; without the Spirit the narrative of the facts would remain dead and unfruitful. The apostolic testimony and the testimony of the Spirit unite, therefore, in one and the same act, but they do so while bringing to it, each of them, a necessary element, the one, the historical narration, the other, the inward evidence. This relation is still reproduced at the present day in every living sermon drawn from the Scriptures. Peter, in like manner, distinguishes these two testimonies in Acts v. 32 : “*And we are witnesses of these things, as well as the Holy Spirit whom God has given to those who obey him.*” We understand, after this, why, when the apostles wished to fill the place of Judas, they chose two men who had accompanied Jesus from the baptism of John even to His resurrection (Acts i. 21, 22).—The *καὶ ὑμεῖς* signifies therefore : “*And you also, you will have your special part in this testimony.*”—The present *μαρτυρεῖτε*, *you bear witness*, which we have translated by the future, does not by any means refer, as *Weiss* and *Keil* think, to the present moment, when the disciples are already bearing witness. Besides the circumstance that the fact was at that time true only in a very limited sense, why should it be mentioned here, since the question is of the future and the testimony of the Spirit ? This present transports the disciples to the time when the Spirit shall speak : “*And then, on this foundation you bear witness also.*”

xvi. 1-4. “*I have spoken these things to you, that you may not be offended. 2. They shall put you out of their synagogues ; yea, the hour is coming that whoever kills you will think that he is doing service to God. 3. And they will do these things to you,<sup>1</sup> because they have not known the Father nor me. But I have told them to you in order that, when the hour shall have come, you may remember<sup>2</sup> that I told you of them. I did not say them to you at the beginning, because I was with you.*”—After this interruption, designed to encourage the apostles, Jesus comes to the more serious things which He has to announce to them on the subject which occupies His thought. The preceding picture makes especially prominent the culpability of the persecutors ; the following words describe rather the sufferings of the persecuted. The faith of the apostles might have been shaken in view of the impenitence and hostility of their people.—*Ἀλλά*, as often, a term of gradation (2 Cor. vii. 11) : “*Not only this ; but you must expect what is worse.*” *Ἦρα* designates the contents of the hour, as *willed* of God. The fanatical zeal of Paul, at the time of Stephen’s martyrdom, is in certain respects an example of the spiritual state described in ver. 2 (Acts xxvi. 9), although in him ignorance surpassed hatred, and hatred of Jesus was not in his heart hatred of God, as in the case indicated in xv. 23 ; comp. 1 Tim. i. 13. Ver. 3 describes the climax of moral *blindness* : to imagine oneself to be serving God by the very act which is the expression of the most intense hatred against Him !

<sup>1</sup> T. R. reads *ἔμιν* after *ποιήσουσιν* with  $\aleph$  hour of these things) and after *μνημονεύετε*. L. D L some Mnn. Italic Cop. ; 12 Mjj. Mnn. • Mnn. It. Vulg. read it after *ὦρα* only ;  $\aleph$  Y T I<sup>2119</sup> Syr. reject it.

<sup>2</sup> A B H Syr. read *αὐτῶν* twice, after *ὦρα* (the omits it both times.

Such a mode of action can proceed only from the fact that one has reached the point of absolutely failing to know God and Christ. Ver. 4 returns, after the digression, to the thought of ver. 1, and closes it by uniting itself with vv. 2, 3. The ἀλλά, *but*, has been explained in various ways. It seems to me to form an antithesis to the understood idea: "I understand the Lorrer which the prospects that I open before you must inspire within you; *but* I have thought it more useful to reveal them to you freely at last, a thing which I should not have been willing to do until the present moment."—These events, which in themselves would have been for them a cause of stumbling, will, when once foretold, be changed by the words which He utters at this hour, into a support for their faith; comp. xiii. 19 and xiv. 29.—As long as Jesus was with them, it was upon Him that the hatred fell; He sheltered them, so to speak, with His body. Now that they are about to find themselves unprotected, they must be forewarned; comp. Luke xxii. 36, 37, words which, in another form, contain an analogous thought, and which must have been pronounced nearly at the same moment with these of John. It seems to us impossible to reconcile with these words: "*I did not say these things to you from the beginning,*" the place which is occupied in the discourse of Matt. x. by the positive prediction of the persecutions of which the Church will be the object. It cannot be said, with *Chrysostom* and *Euthymius*, that the sufferings here predicted are much *more terrible* than those of which Matt. x. 17, 21, 28 speaks; nor, with *Bengel* and *Tholuck*, that the present description is *more detailed* than that; nor again, with *Hofmann* and *Luthardt*, that Jesus makes this prediction of the persecutions the *more exclusive* object of the discoursing at this farewell moment. All these distinctions are too subtle. It is in vain that *Westcott* rests for support upon the expression ἐξ ἀρχῆς, which would indicate a continuity, and not merely, like ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, a point of departure. It is better to recognize the fact that Matthew unites in the great discourse of ch. x. all the instructions given at different times to the Twelve respecting the future persecutions of which they will be the object, as in chs. v.-vii. he unites all the elements of the new Christian law, and in chs. xxiv., xxv. all the eschatological prophecies; and this because, in the composition of the *Logia*, he did not take account of the *chronological* order, but only of the subjects treated. This characteristic finds its explanation as soon as the mode of composition of the first Gospel is understood (see my *Etudes bibliques*, ii. pp. 18, 19, 3d ed.).

## 3. xvi. 5-15.

Jesus now describes *the victory* which the disciples will gain over the world which has risen up against Him. He first connects with His departure the coming of the divine *agent* (already announced in xv. 26, 27), who will gain the victory through them, vv. 5-7; He then describes the *manner* of this victory, vv. 8-11; finally, He speaks to the disciples of the interior operation of the Spirit, which is the *condition* of it, vv. 12-15.

Vv. 5-7. "*But now I go away to him who sent me; and no one of you asks*

me, Whither goest thou? 6. But, because I have said these things to you, sorrow has filled your heart. 7. But I tell you the truth: it is expedient for you that I go away; for, if I go not away, the support will not come to you; but when I shall have gone away, I will send him to you."—The idea of the departure in vv. 5, 6 is naturally connected with the last words of ver. 4: "because I was with you." It forms the transition to the promise of the Paraclete in ver. 7, since the departure of Jesus is the condition of the sending of the Holy Spirit. *De Wette* and *Lücke* have needlessly proposed to place ver. 6 between the two clauses of ver. 5.—The connection is clear; from the great conflict Jesus passes to the great promise. Jesus is grieved at seeing His disciples preoccupied, only with the separation which is approaching, and not at all with the glorious goal to which this departure will lead Him. Love should impel them to ask Him respecting that new state into which He is about to enter (xiv. 28). Instead of this, He sees them preoccupied only with the desolate condition in which His departure is to leave them, and plunged thereby into a gloomy dejection. *Weiss* thinks that Jesus means: "You do not ask me further because now you understand." But the light does not come into their minds until later (vv. 29, 30). There is evidently in the words: "No one of you asks me," a friendly reproach. As *Hengstenberg* says: "Jesus would have been glad to find in them at this moment the joyous enthusiasm of hearts which open themselves to the prospects of a new epoch, and which do not unceasingly continue to put presumptuous questions respecting what it promised them." The questions of Peter, Thomas and Philip did not bear upon this luminous side of His near departure, and besides, at the moment when Jesus was speaking, they were already quite at a distant point of the conversation.

The words: *Because I have said these things to you* (ver. 6), signify, as following upon ver. 5: Because I have spoken to you of separation, of conflict, of sufferings. In ver. 7 Jesus makes appeal first, as in xiv. 2, to the conviction which they have of His veracity. The *ἐγώ, I*, at the beginning, emphasizes in opposition to their ignorance the knowledge which He Himself possesses of the true state of things. Then He announces to them spontaneously a part of these joyful things which they were not eager to ask of Him. This departure is His re-establishment in the divine state, and the latter is the condition of the sending of the Spirit which He will secure for them. We find here again the idea of vii. 39: "*The Spirit was not yet, because Jesus had not yet been glorified.*" That He may on their behalf dispose of this supreme agent, it is necessary that He should be Himself restored to the divine state. This mission implies, therefore, the complete glorification of His humanity.—He does not, in this passage, make any mention of the sacrifice of the cross and of the reconciliation of the world, that first condition of the gift of the Spirit. This silence is explained by the declaration of ver. 12: "*I have yet many things to say to you; but you cannot bear them.*" John explains himself very distinctly on this point in his Epistle (ii. 1, 2, v. 8, 8); which proves, indeed, that he has not allowed

<sup>1</sup> T. R. with *Σ B D L Y* It<sup>al</sup> omits *εγω*, which is found in 10 Mj., 120 Mn. It<sup>perique</sup> Syr.

himself to make Jesus speak here after his own fancy. Besides, *Reuss* is himself obliged, indeed, to acknowledge that this part of the discourse is addressed expressly to the Eleven, and not, as he always affirms, to the readers of the evangelist, and he tries in vain to escape the consequence which follows from this fact in favor of the *historical* truth of these discourses.

Vv. 8-11. "And when he shall have come, he will convince the world of sin, of righteousness and of judgment; 9, of sin, because they believe not<sup>1</sup> on me; 10, of righteousness, because I go to my<sup>2</sup> Father and you will see me no more; 11, of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged." Here is the description of the victory which, through the agency of the disciples, the Holy Spirit will gain over the world. The discourse of St. Peter at Pentecost and its results are the best commentary on this promise. It will be a victory of a moral nature, the mode of which is expressed by the term ἐλέγχειν, to convince of wrong or of error; here both the one and the other.—This word does not also designate a definitive condemnation, as the Fathers, and then *de Wette* and *Brückner*, thought, as if the Holy Spirit were to demonstrate to lost humanity the justice of its condemnation. Ver. 11 proves that the prince of the world alone is already judged. If, then, the world can profit by the reproof of the Holy Spirit, it is still capable of salvation. This is proved by the effect of the apostles' preaching, in the Acts, in the case of a portion of the hearers. The reproof given by the Spirit may lead either to conversion or to hardening; comp. 2 Cor. ii. 15, 16. The apostles are not named as instruments of this internal operation of the Spirit. Their persons disappear in the glory of the divine being who works by their means. But it is certainly through their intervention that it takes place, as the πρὸς ἑμᾶς of ver. 7 proves; comp. also vv. 13-15.

The error of the world on the one side, and the divine truth on the other, will be demonstrated with regard to three points. The absence of the article before the substantives, *sin, righteousness, judgment*, leaves to these three notions the most indefinite meaning. Jesus will give precision to the application of them by the three ὅτι, *in that* or *because*, which follow. If this explanation of Jesus Himself failed us, we should undoubtedly regard the idea of righteousness as the intermediate one between the two others: *righteousness* applying itself to *sin* to produce *judgment*. But the explanation of Jesus places us on an altogether different path. Only it concerns us to know whether we must translate the three ὅτι by *in that* or *because*. In the first case, the fact mentioned afterwards is that in which the sin, righteousness, judgment, consist, and the conjunction ὅτι may be regarded as dependent on each of the three substantives; in the second, the conjunction in each instance depends on the verb *convince*, and announces a fact which will establish the truth of God and the error of the world on these three points. The first interpretation, as it appears to me, cannot be applied to the second of these points.

The *world*, here the Jewish world, was in error respecting sin, seeking to

<sup>1</sup> Some Mnn. It<sup>perique</sup> Vulg. read οὐκ ἐπιστεύσαν (did not believe).

<sup>2</sup> B D L some Mnn. It<sup>perique</sup> Vulg. Cop. omit μου after πατέρα.

find it only in the shameful excesses of tax-gatherers and the gross infractions of the Levitical law. Israel condemned and rejected Jesus as a malefactor because of His violations of the Sabbath and His alleged blasphemies. The Spirit will reveal to it its own state of sin by means of a crime of which it does not dream, unbelief towards its Messiah, the messenger of God ; comp. the discourse of Peter, on the day of Pentecost, Acts ii. 22, 23, 36 ; and iii. 14, 15. Sincere Jews recognized immediately the truth of this reproof (Acts ii. 37). And this office of the Spirit continues always. Jesus is the good ; to reject Him is to prefer the evil to the good and to wish to persevere in it ; comp. iii. 19, 20. This is what the Spirit without cessation makes the unbelieving world feel by His agents here on earth.—Thus *περὶ ἀμαρτίας ὅτι* does not mean : He will convince the world of sin which consists in unbelief ; but He will convince it of its state of sin in general, and this by rendering it palpable to it by means of a decisive fact, its unbelief with regard to the Messiah. It goes without saying that this work of the Spirit is not to be confounded with the *usus elencticus* of the law.

The Jewish world is also in error as to the way in which it has understood *righteousness*. Exalting itself with pride in its meritorious works, Israel has taken its position in opposition to Jesus as the representative of righteousness, and has rejected Him from its midst as an unworthy member. The Holy Spirit will fulfil with reference to this judgment the function of a court of appeal. Holy Friday seemed to have ascribed sin to Jesus, and righteousness to His judges ; but Pentecost will reverse this sentence ; it will assign righteousness to the condemned One of Golgotha and sin to His judges. This meaning results first from the contrast between the two terms *sin* and *righteousness*, then from the following explanatory clause, according to which the righteousness which is here in question is that which glorification will confer upon Jesus in the invisible world, and which the sending of the Spirit by Him to His own will proclaim here below. This righteousness cannot therefore be, as *Augustine, Melancthon, Calvin, Luther, Lampe, Hengstenberg*, etc., think, the justification which the *believer* finds in Christ, or, as *Lange* supposes, the righteousness of God, who deprives the Jews, as a punishment for their unbelief, of the visible presence of the Messiah and of His earthly kingdom (“*you shall see me no more*”). In the words : *because I go to my Father*, Jesus presents His ascension, the end in which His death issues, as intended to afford the demonstration of His righteousness ; and He adds what follows : *and you will see me no more*, to complete this proof : “*You will feel me to be present and active, even when you shall see me no more.*” The body of Jesus will have disappeared ; but His divine activity in this state of invisibility will prove His exaltation to the Father, and consequently His perfect righteousness (Acts ii. 24, 26).

The *judgment*, of which the Holy Spirit will furnish to the world the demonstration, will not be that great judgment of the Gentiles which the Jews were expecting, nor even that of the Jewish world convinced of sin. For the final sentence of the one party and the other is not yet pronounced. The *prince of this world* alone has from henceforth filled up the measure of his perversity, and can consequently be finally judged. Until Holy Friday,

Satan had not displayed his murderous hate, except with reference to the guilty. On that day, he assailed the life of the perfectly righteous One. In vain had Jesus said: *He has nothing in me*. Satan exhausted on Him his murderous rage (viii. 44 and 40). This murder without excuse called forth an immediate and irrevocable sentence against him. He is judged and deprived of power. And it is the Holy Spirit who proclaims this sentence here on earth, by calling the world to render homage to a new Master. This summons reveals the profound revolution which has just been wrought in the spiritual domain. Every sinner rescued from Satan and regenerated by the Spirit is the monument of the condemnation of him who formerly called himself the prince of this world.

Thus by the testimony of the Spirit the world, righteous in its own eyes, will be declared sinful; the condemned malefactor will be proved righteous; and the true author of this crime will receive his irrevocable sentence: such are the three ideas contained in this passage, whose powerful originality it is impossible not to recognize. It does not differ except as to form from xii. 31, 32; the three actors mentioned—the world, Satan and Jesus—are the same, as well as the parts which are attributed to them. Our passage only adds this idea: that it is the Holy Spirit who will reveal to men the true nature of the invisible drama consummated on the cross. The result of this reproof of the Spirit is that some remain in the *sin* of unbelief and participate thus in the *judgment* of the prince of this world, while others range themselves on the side of the *righteousness* of Christ, and are withdrawn from the judgment pronounced upon Satan.—But if this victory of the Spirit is to be gained by means of the apostles, it must be that previously the work of the Spirit has been consummated *in them*. This is the reason why Jesus passes from the action of the Spirit on the world *through* believers to His action *in* believers themselves (vv. 12–15).

Vv. 12, 13. “*I have yet many things to say to you; but you have not now<sup>1</sup> the strength to bear them. 13. When he, the Spirit of truth, shall have come, he will lead you into all the truth;<sup>2</sup> for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever<sup>3</sup> he shall have heard,<sup>4</sup> he shall speak, and he shall announce to you the things to come.*”—Jesus begins by assigning a place to the teaching of the Spirit following upon His own. At this very moment He had just told His disciples so many things which they could only half understand! From the standpoint of confidence, He had concealed nothing from them (xv. 15); but with a view to their spiritual incapacity, He had kept to Himself many revelations which were reserved for a later teaching. This subsequent revelation will, in the first place, bear upon the very contents of the teaching of Jesus, which it will cause to be better understood (xiv. 25, 26); then, on various points which Jesus had not even touched; for example, redemp-

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  omits  $\alpha\rho\tau\iota$  (now).

<sup>2</sup> T. R. with 11 Mjj. Mun.:  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$   $\pi\alpha\sigma\alpha\nu$   $\tau\eta\nu$   $\alpha\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu$ . A B Y Orig.:  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$   $\tau.$   $\alpha\lambda.$   $\pi\alpha\sigma\alpha\nu$ . D L I Hieronime:  $\epsilon\nu$   $\tau\eta$   $\alpha\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$   $\pi\alpha\sigma\eta$ .  $\aleph$ :  $\epsilon\nu$   $\tau\eta$   $\alpha\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$ .

<sup>3</sup>  $\Delta\nu$  is omitted by  $\aleph$  B D L 4 Mun.

<sup>4</sup> T. R. with 10 Mjj.:  $\alpha\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\eta$ . B D E H Y. Orig.:  $\alpha\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota$  (shall hear)  $\aleph$  L:  $\alpha\kappa\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\iota$  (hears).

tion through the death of the Messiah, the relation of grace to the law, the conversion of the Gentiles without any legal condition, the final conversion of the Jews at present unbelieving, the destiny of the Church even to its consummation—in a word, the contents of the Epistles and the Apocalypse, so far as they pass beyond those of the teaching of Jesus.

The Spirit is presented in ver. 13 by the term *ὁδηγεῖν*, to *show the way*, under the figure of a guide who introduces a traveller into an unknown country. This country is *the truth*, the essential truth of which Jesus has spoken—that of salvation—and this truth is Himself (xiv. 6). This domain of the new creation, which Jesus can only show them from without, in the objective form, the Spirit will reveal to them by making them themselves enter into it through a personal experience.—The two readings *εἰς* and *ἐν* harmonize with the verb *ὁδηγεῖν*; according to the second, the disciples are considered as being already within the domain where the Spirit leads them and causes them to move forward.—The word *all* brings out the contrast with the incomplete teaching of Jesus.

The infallibility of this guide arises from the same cause as that of Jesus Himself (vii. 17, 18): the absence of all self-originated and consequently unsound productivity. All the revelations of the Spirit will be drawn from the divine plan realized in Jesus. Satan is a liar precisely because he speaks according to an altogether different method, deriving what he says *from his own resources* (viii. 44). The term *ὅσα ἂν*, *all the things which*, leads us to think of a series of momentary acts. On every occasion when the apostle shall have need of wisdom, the Spirit will communicate to him whatever of the objective truth will be appropriate to the given moment.—Whether we read the future with the *Vatican*, or the present with the *Sinaitic MS.*, or the aorist subjunctive with the *T. R.*, the verb *shall hear* must in any case be completed by the idea: from God respecting Christ (xv. 26). The question is evidently of the teaching of things *not yet heard* on the earth (ver. 12), consequently of the special revelation granted to the apostles, distinct from that which every Christian receives by means of theirs. That revelation has a *primordial* character, while this latter one is a mere internal reproduction of the light contained in the apostolic teaching, first oral, then written. It is therefore only indirectly included in this promise. The expression "*all the truth*" contains the thought that during the present economy no new teaching respecting Christ will come to be added to that of the apostles.—To this teaching of the Spirit belongs, as a peculiarly important element, the revelation of the destiny of the Church, of *the things to come*. *Kai, and even*. As Jesus is not only the Christ *come*, but also the Christ *coming* (*ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, Apoc. i. 4), these *things to come* (*ἐρχόμενα*) are also contained in His person. The words of xiv. 26 contained the formula of the inspiration of our Gospels; ver. 13 gives that of the Epistles and the Apocalypse.

Vv. 14, 15. "*He shall glorify me, for He shall take of what is mine and shall announce it to you. 15. All that the Father has is mine; therefore I said that he takes<sup>1</sup> of mine and shall announce it to you.*"—The *asyndeton*

<sup>1</sup> T. R. with A K II, a part of the Mnn. *It<sup>1</sup>erque Vulg. Cop.* reads *ληψεται* (*shall take*),

between vv. 13 and 14 proves that Jesus only reproduces under a new and more emphatic form in ver. 14 the thought of vv. 12, 13. The work of the Spirit introducing the apostles into the truth will be only the increasing glorification of Jesus in their hearts. After the Father shall have exalted Christ personally to glory, the Holy Spirit will cause His celestial image to beam forth from on high into the hearts of the disciples, and, through them, into the hearts of all believers. There is a mysterious exchange here and, as it were, a rivalry of divine humility. The Son labors only to glorify the Father, and the Spirit desires only to glorify the Son. Christ, His word and His work—herein is the sole text on which the Spirit will comment in the souls of the disciples. He will, by one and the same act, cause the disciples to grow in the truth and Jesus to grow greater in them. For the understanding of this word *glorify*, comp. the experience admirably described by St. Paul in 2 Cor. iii. 17, 18 and iv. 6.

In designating the source from which the Spirit will draw as *that which is mine*, Jesus seems to contradict what He has said in ver. 13 ; at least, if “from the Father” is understood after *shall hear*. Jesus gives the explanation of this apparent contradiction in ver. 15, by means of the words : “All that the Father has is mine.” The Father’s treasure is common to Him with the Son. This word reveals, as does no other, the consciousness which Christ had of the greatness of His manifestation. The *Christian* fact is the measure of the *divine* for humanity. There is nothing essentially Christian which is not divine ; there is nothing divine which does not concentrate and realize itself in the Christian fact.—“*Therefore I said*” means here : “Therefore I have been able to say.”—The present *takes* is better attested by documentary evidence (ver. 15) than the future *shall take*, and it is more in accordance with the present tenses, *has, is* ; the future is a correction in accordance with ver. 14, *He takes* : it is the present of the idea, designating the permanent function. After the present *takes*, the future *will declare* signifies : “and, after having taken, He will announce in each particular case.” *Westcott* calls attention to the three : *and He will announce to you* (vv. 13, 14, 15), which form, as it were, a consoling refrain. Thus there is not a real breath of the Spirit which is not at the service of the person of the historic Christ. So St. Paul makes the cry of adoration : “*Jesus Lord!*” the criterion of every true operation of the divine Spirit (1 Cor. xii. 3) ; comp. also 1 John iv. 3. If we recall to mind how the glorifying of the creature constitutes in the Scriptures the capital crime, we shall understand what such words imply with relation to the person of Christ.

All these discourses, and in particular this masculine *ἐκεῖνος*, *he*, ver. 14, rest on the idea of the *personality* of the Holy Spirit. As *Weiss* says on account of xv. 26 : “The Spirit is conceived as a personal manifestation like to that of Christ Himself.”

But B D E G L M S U Y Δ A Syr. most of the Mss. read λαμβανει (*takes*). ⚭ omits the whole

15th verse (a confounding of the two αναγγελει υμιν).

III.—*The last Farewell*: xvi. 16-33.

From these distant prospects which He has just opened to the disciples with respect to their future work (xv. 1-xvi. 15), Jesus returns to the great matter which occupies the thought of the present moment, that of His impending departure. This is natural; thus He should close. At the same time, the conversational form reappears, which is no less in the natural course of things.

Vv. 16-18. "*Yet a little while, and you see me no more*;<sup>1</sup> *again, a little while, and you shall see me, because I go to the Father.*"<sup>2</sup> 17. *Therefore some of his disciples said among themselves: What does this mean, which he says to us: Yet a little while and you do not see me*;<sup>3</sup> *again, a little while and you will see me? And that other word: Because I<sup>4</sup> go to the Father.* 18. *They said therefore: What does he mean by this word*:<sup>5</sup> *A little while? We do not understand what He says.*"—The promise of Jesus' return, in order to be consoling, must not be at too long a remove. Jesus affirms its very near realization. Two brief periods of time and it will take place! *Weiss*, with *Lange*, *Hengstenberg*, etc., refers this return to the appearances of Jesus after His resurrection. The sequel (see especially vv. 25, 26) will show the impossibility of this explanation. But from this point the *asyndeton* between vv. 15, 16 leads us to suppose a much more profound connection of thought between these two sayings than could be the case with this meaning. If, in conformity with what precedes, the passage in ver. 16 ff. is referred to the spiritual seeing again through the coming of the promised Paraclete, as in xiv. 17-23, everything in what follows is simply explained. Filled with the idea of His glorification by the Spirit in the hearts of the disciples (vv. 13-16), Jesus calls this return a mutual *seeing again* (vv. 16, 22). It is in this living reappearance in the soul of His own that the approaching separation will end without delay.—The first *μικρόν*, *a little while*, refers to the short space of time which separates the present moment from that of His death; the second, to the interval between His death and the day of Pentecost. Four Alexandrian authorities reject the words which close the verse: *Because I go to my Father*; they would, in this case, have been introduced here in the other documents from ver. 17. But it seems to me rather that the expression: *You will see me because I go away*, appeared absurd and contradictory, and that these last words were omitted here. If they were allowed to remain in ver. 17, it was because there the *ὅτι* might be regarded as depending on *ὃ λέγει*, in the sense of *that*, and not on *you will see* in the sense of *because*. But it was not considered that, by preserving them in ver. 17, their omission in ver. 16 was condemned, since ver. 17 is the repetition of ver. 16. A glance at *Tischendorf's* note shows that *Origen* is probably the author of this omission, as of so many other errors in the Alexandrian text. This

<sup>1</sup> Instead of *οὐ* (*not*), **Σ B D L A** read *οὐκετι* (*no more*);

<sup>2</sup> **Σ B D L It<sup>ab19</sup>** Cop. omit the words *ὅτι . . . πατέρα*, which are read in 13 Mjj. most of the Mm. It<sup>ab19</sup> Syr. etc.

<sup>3</sup> **Σ** omits the words *μικρόν και . . . παλιν*

(confusion of the two *μικρόν και*).

<sup>4</sup> *Εγώ* is omitted by **Σ A B L M A II, 11 Mm.** It<sup>perique</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> Instead of *τουτο τι ε. ο λεγει*, **B L Y It** Orig. read *τι ε. τουτο ο λ.*, and **Σ D τι ε. τουτο**.

*because*, which embarrassed Origen, is clear as one refers this seeing again to Pentecost. It is *because* Jesus returns to the Father that He can again be seen by believers through the Holy Spirit (vii. 39, xvi. 7).—Nevertheless, in expressing Himself as He does, Jesus proposed a problem to His disciples ; He is not unaware of it. These two brief delays (*a little while*), which were to have opposite results, and the apparently contradictory idea : “ *You will see me because I go away,*” must have been for them enigmas. We find here again the educational process which we have already observed in xiv. 4, 7. By these paradoxical expressions, Jesus designedly calls forth the revelation of their last doubts, to the end of having the power entirely to remove them.

The kind of *aside* which took place among some of the apostles (ver. 17) would not be easily explained, if they were still surrounding Jesus, as had been the fact at the time when He uttered the words of xv. 1 ff. It is probable, therefore, that, when uttering the 16th verse, Jesus puts Himself again on His course of march, the disciples following Him at some distance. This explains how they can be conversing with each other, as is related in vv. 17, 18. The words : *I go away to my Father*, were perhaps the signal for starting.—The objections of the disciples are natural, from their point of view. Where for us all is clear, for them all was mysterious. If Jesus wishes to found the Messianic kingdom, why go away ? If He does not wish it, why return ? Then, how can they imagine these contrary phases which are to be accomplished one after another ? Finally : *I come, because I go away !* Is there not reason for their crying out : *We do not understand what He says* (ver. 18) ? All this clearly proves the truth of the narrative ; could a later writer have thus placed himself in the very quick of this situation ? *Kai orte* : “ *and this, because.*” This word increases for them the difficulty of understanding. There is, as it were, a kind of impatience in their manner of expression in ver. 18.

Vv. 19, 20. “ *Now<sup>1</sup> Jesus knew that they desired<sup>2</sup> to ask him, and he said to them : Do you inquire among yourselves concerning this that I said : In a little while you will not see me, and again in a little while you will see me. 20. Verily, verily, I say to you that you will weep and lament, but the world will rejoice ; you<sup>3</sup> will be sorrowful, but your sorrow will be turned into joy.*”—Jesus anticipates their question, and gives them a last proof of His higher knowledge, not only by showing them that He knew of Himself the questions which occupy their thoughts, but also by solving, as far as possible at this moment, all these enigmas. Only, instead of explaining to them the supreme facts which are about to succeed each other so rapidly—an explanation which they could not understand—He limits Himself to describing to them the opposite feelings through which they will themselves suddenly pass, and which will be the consequences of these facts : the greatest joy will suddenly succeed to the greatest grief ; and all this will be brief, like the hour of childbirth for a woman ; there would only be needed for Jesus time for

<sup>1</sup> **Σ B D L** omit *οὖν* after *εἶπω*.

<sup>2</sup> **Σ A D A I** <sup>1</sup> *superius* Syr.<sup>sch</sup> Cop. omit *δέ* (*but*).

<sup>2</sup> **Σ** : *ημελλον* instead of *ηθελον*.

going to His Father and returning. It is a terrible hour for them to pass through ; but He cannot give them escape from it ; and after this, their joy will be unmingled and their power without limits. Such are the contents of vv. 20–24.—The tears and lamentations of ver. 20 find their explanation in ch. xx., in the tears of Mary Magdalene and in the entire condition of the disciples after the death of Jesus. The appearances of the Risen One only half healed this wound ; the perfect and enduring joy was only given on the day of Pentecost (ver. 22). The words : *But the world shall rejoice*, as far as : *sorrowful*, are not the real antithesis of the first clause. They form only a secondary contrast. The real antithesis of the first clause is in the last words of the verse : *But your sorrow shall be turned into joy*. The *ἀλλά*, *but*, expresses this opposition strongly, while marking the contrast with the clause which immediately precedes.

Vv. 21, 22. “ *A woman, when she is in travail, has sorrow, because her hour is come ; but when she has brought forth the child, she remembers no more her anguish for the joy she has that a man is born into the world.* 22. *And you also now have sorrow ;<sup>2</sup> but I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice ; and your joy no one shall take<sup>3</sup> from you.*”—The point of comparison is the sudden passage from extreme sorrow to extreme joy. It must be limited to this. The idea of the bringing forth of a new world, which is to result from this hour of anguish, does not seem to be in the thought of Jesus.—The expression *her hour* perhaps alludes to the sorrowful hour through which Jesus Himself is to pass (*my hour*). The word *a man* sets forth the greatness of the event accomplished, and gives the ground of the mother's joy.

Ver. 22 makes the application of the comparison. The term : *I will see you*, cannot be synonymous with : *you shall see me* (vv. 16, 17, 19). The fact of the spiritual seeing again is presented here from the point of view of Jesus, not of the disciples. The death of Jesus not only separated the disciples from Him, but also *Him* from the disciples. He Himself, when transporting Himself to this moment, said in ver. 4 : “ *When I was with you ;*” and after His resurrection, in Luke xxiv. 44 : “ *When I was yet with you.*” It is for this reason that, not being able at that time to keep them Himself, He prays the Father to keep them in His stead (xvii. 12, 13). There is no longer between Him and them the bond of sensible communion, and there is not yet that of spiritual communion. For this reason, when He shall return to them spiritually, it will be a seeing again for Him as well as for them. After this interval, in which He no longer Himself held the reins of their life, will come the day of Pentecost, when He will again have the flock under His own hand, and will sovereignly govern them from the midst of His divine state. The resurrection in itself alone could not yet form this new bond. *Weiss* has therefore no good foundation for finding in this expression : *I will see you again*, a proof in favor of his explanation (comp. ver. 25). The last words : *and no one*, are to be explained according to him in the sense that, even when the Risen One had once departed, the joy of the resurrection never-

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  reads  $\sigma$  before  $\alpha\rho\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$ .

<sup>2</sup> B D  $\Gamma$  It<sup>aliq</sup> :  $\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota$  (*shall take*), instead of

<sup>3</sup> A D L 12 Mm. It<sup>aliq</sup> Cop. :  $\epsilon\chi\epsilon\rho\epsilon$  instead of  $\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota$  (*takes*).

theless continued in the hearts of the disciples ; but see on ver. 24.—The present *αἶπει*, *takes away*, is the true reading. Jesus transports Himself in thought to that day.

Vv. 23, 24. “At that day you shall not question me as to anything : verily, verily, I say to you, that all that which<sup>1</sup> you shall ask the Father,<sup>2</sup> he will give it to you in my name. 24. Hitherto you have asked nothing in my name ; ask,<sup>3</sup> and you shall receive, that your joy may be fulfilled.”—Jesus here describes the privileges connected with this spiritual seeing again, the source for them of the joy promised in ver. 22. They will be : a full *knowledge* (ver. 23a) and a full *power* (ver. 23b). In the first clause the emphasis is on ἐμέ, *me* (the accentuated form) ; they will have no need to ask *Him*, as visibly present, concerning what shall appear to them obscure and mysterious, as they had the intention to do at this moment (ver. 19). Having the Paraclete within them, they will be able to ask all freely and directly from the Father (comp. xiv. 12-14). The reading of A : ὅ, τι ἄν, *whatsoever*, may well be the true one. After having changed this ὅ, τι into ὅτι, *because*, one of the pronouns ὁ or ὅσα was necessarily added as an object ; then the ὅτι was omitted as useless (*Meyer*). *Weiss* prefers, with *Tischendorf*, the ἄν τι of the *Vatican MS.*, which was altered in consequence of the introduction of the recitative ὅτι. In any case, the sense is the same. It is very evident that so considerable a change in their relation to God and Christ as that which is here promised to the apostles could not have resulted from the appearances of the Risen One. *Weiss* endeavors in vain to maintain this application. Acts i. 6 proves clearly that after the resurrection the disciples did not cease to ask questions of Jesus personally when they saw Him again. So *Weiss* gives to ἐρωτᾶν here, not its ordinary meaning *to ask a question*, but the meaning *to ask for a thing*, a meaning which it sometimes has certainly (iv. 31, 40, 47, xiv. 16, etc. : to ask whether one will give). But why in this case use two different verbs (ἐρωτᾶν and αἰτεῖν) to say the same thing ? And, above all, the relation to ver. 19 and ver. 30 absolutely excludes this meaning. The word ἐρωτᾶν has certainly the meaning to inquire (to ask light), and αἰτεῖν the more general sense of praying, to ask a gift or help. Jesus therefore means : “You will no longer address your questions to me, as when I was visibly with you ; and in general I declare to you that as to what you may have need of, you will be able, because<sup>1</sup> of the communion established henceforth through the Holy Spirit between yourselves and Him (your Father), to address yourselves directly to Him.”—The limiting phrase *in my name* would refer, according to the T. R., which has in its favor some Mjj. and the ancient versions, to the word *ask* ; to this ver. 24 also points ; nevertheless, this reading may come from the parallel passages in xiv. 13 and 26, and from the following verse. These words should be placed with the *Vatican* and *Sinaitic MSS.*, etc., at the end of the verse, in connection with the verb *to give*.

<sup>1</sup> Instead of ὅτι ὅσα ἄν which the T. R. reads with 10 Mjj. Mnn., A reads ὅτι (probably ο τι) ἄν, B C D L Y It. Orig. ἄν τι. § ὅτι ο ἄν, X some Mnn. ὅτι ο εἶπ.

<sup>2</sup> § B C L X Y Δ Sah. Orig. place ἐν τ. ὀνομα.

μου (*in my name*) after δώσει ὑμῖν (*will give you*), while T. R. with A D F Δ Π It Syr. place these words after τον πατερα (*the Father*).

<sup>3</sup> § some Mnn. read αιτησαθε instead of αιτετε.

It is on the basis of the divine revelation which God has given of Jesus to believers and of the knowledge which they have received from Him, that He will give to them the gifts and helps thus promised.—But as this full revelation of Jesus is made in their hearts only by the Spirit (xiv. 17–23), it follows that until the day of Pentecost the disciples could not have really prayed *in the name of Jesus*. There is therefore no reproach in the words: “Hitherto you have not prayed in my name,” as if Jesus meant that they had been wanting in faith or zeal; it is simply the true indication of their moral state up to the time of the inward revelation which the Spirit will effect within them. From that moment, united in heart with Him, they will be able to pray as if they were Himself. By the present imperative: *ask* (*αἰτεῖτε*), Jesus transports Himself to this great day which is foretold. Perfect and enduring joy will then take the place of the extreme grief of a moment.—Jesus, however, perceives how all this must remain obscure to them. He acknowledges this, and refers them to that very day itself which He has just promised them, when everything will be finally made clear for them.

Vv. 25–27.—“*I have spoken these things to you in similitudes; but<sup>1</sup> the hour is coming when<sup>2</sup> I shall no more speak to you in similitudes, but when I shall speak<sup>3</sup> to you openly of the Father.* 26. *In that day ye will need only to ask in my name; and I say not to you that I will pray the Father for you; 27, for the Father himself loves you, because you have loved me and have believed that I came forth from God.*”<sup>4</sup>—It is not necessary to understand by the *similitudes* of which Jesus speaks the figures of the vine and the branches or the woman in childbirth, which He has just used, still less of the parables which have been preserved for us by the Synoptics. He means to characterize in general the manner of speaking of divine things in figurative language; comp. the terms *Father’s house, way, to come, to see again, to manifest oneself, to make one’s abode*, etc. It belongs only to the Spirit to speak the language which is really adequate to the divine truth. All teaching in words is but a figure, so long as the Spirit Himself does not explain. Παρησία here: *in appropriate terms*, which do not compromise the idea by exposing it to a false interpretation; comp. xi. 14. On the word *παροιμία*, see x. 6.—We may hesitate between the two verbs *ἀπαγγέλλειν* which signifies rather *to announce* (Alex.) and *ἀναγγέλλειν, to declare* (Byz.).—From the words *περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς, concerning the Father*, Weiss concludes that this promise can bear only upon the contents of vv. 23, 24, and that the expression to speak *in figures* refers only to the symbolic term *Father* by which Jesus has just designated God. But how can we in a natural way explain in this sense the plurals *πάντα* and *παροιμίας*? Then Keil asks with good reason if the name of Father was for Jesus a simple figure. Is it not evident that the question here is of the teaching of the Holy Spirit, which will be a revelation of the Father, of His character, His will, His plans with relation to

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  B C D F X Y I<sup>tr</sup> Hierique Orig. omit *αλλα* (*but*).

<sup>2</sup>  $\aleph$  read= *σου* instead of *σε*.

<sup>3</sup> The MSS. are divided between *απαγγέλω*

( $\aleph$  A B etc.) and *αναγγέλω* (E G H etc.).

<sup>4</sup> Instead of *θεου* (*God*), B C D L X 2 Mun. Syreth Cop. Sah. read *πατρος* (*the Father*).

humanity? Besides, *Weiss* finds himself obliged, from ver. 25 onward, to acknowledge that there can be no longer a question as to the appearances of the Risen One, since the language in which Jesus spoke with His disciples after His resurrection did not differ at all from the ordinary human language which He had made use of previously. But how is it that he does not see that in acknowledging that the state described from ver. 25 onward is that which will follow the day of Pentecost, he retracts by this very fact his whole previous interpretation from ch. xiv. onward? For ver. 26 evidently does not describe a different state from that in vv. 23, 24; the *day* of which ver. 26 speaks and that of which vv. 23 and 25 speak cannot be any other than that of xiv. 20-23. Why should not the *speaking openly of the Father* be the inward fact described in xiv. 23: "The Father and I, we will come and make our abode with him." And if the expression: *I will openly announce* in our ver. 25 refers to the day of Pentecost, as *Weiss* concedes, why should it not be the parallel of the: *I will come again* of xiv. 18?

The declaration of ver. 26 seems, at the first glance, to contradict that of xiv. 16. But in this latter passage, Jesus is still speaking of the time which will precede the day of Pentecost; He says that He will pray for the disciples, *in order that* He may be able to send the Spirit to them; here, on the contrary, the Paraclete is supposed to be already present and acting in them; this is the reason why they pray themselves to the Father in the name of Jesus, because they are in direct communication with Him. Consequently, as long as they abide in this state of union with God, the intercession of Jesus (Rom. viii. 34, Heb. vii. 25) is not necessary for them. But as soon as they sin, they have need of the *advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous* (1 John ii 1, 2). The expression: *I say not that I will pray*, is very admirably adapted to this state. He does not say that He will pray; for so long as they shall be in the normal state of fidelity, they will have no need of this; He prays then *through* them, not *for* them. Nevertheless, He does not say that He will not pray; for it may be that they will still have need of His intercession, if any separation intervenes between them and the Father. We see how completely *Grotius* and others have mistaken the idea in understanding the words: "I say not to you that . . ." in the sense: "*not to say that* I also will pray for you." This is to make Jesus say just the contrary of His thought, as is clearly shown by ver. 27.

On the words: *The Father loves you because you have loved me*, comp. xiv. 21, 23. The perfect tenses indicate a condition already gained: "Because you *are become* those who love me and believe. . . ." In general Jesus does not place faith after love; but here He speaks of a special faith, of the belief in His divine origin. They were heartily attached to His person for a long time before comprehending all His greatness, as they were beginning to comprehend it now.—Jesus comes back in these words from the future, the day of Pentecost, to the work now accomplished in them, because this is the condition and basis of that future (xiv. 17). And in fact the supreme moment is approaching: it is time to affix the seal to this faith now already formed. To this end, Jesus formulates the essential contents of it

in a definite proposition : “ you have believed *that I came forth from God.*” Tischendorf himself rejects the reading of the *Sinaitic MS.* and the other thirteen Mjj. which read : *from the Father*, instead of : *from God*. It is the *divine origin* and mission of Jesus, and not His *filial* relation with God, which must be emphasized at this moment as the essential object of the apostles’ faith. The case is wholly different in ver. 28. The preposition *παρά*, *from*, and the verb *ἐξῆλθον*, *I came forth*, express more than the simple mission, which would be designated by *ἀπό* and *ἐλήλυθα* ; these terms characterize the divine sphere, in general, from which Jesus derives His origin. They well bring out the heroism of the apostles’ faith. In this being of flesh and bones, this weak, despised man, they have been able to recognize a being who came to them from the divine abode.

Ver. 28. “ *I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world ; and again I leave the world and go to the Father.*”—What the disciples had the most difficulty in understanding was that Jesus should leave the world where, in their thought, the Messianic kingdom was to be realized. They had, moreover, no clear idea of the place to which He was going. Jesus starts from what is more clear, in order to explain to them what is less so. They have believed and understood that His *origin* is divine, that He has not, like the rest of men, behind His earthly existence, nothingness, but the bosom of the Father (ver. 27). Hence it follows that this world is for Him only a place of passage, that He has *come* to it, and come only to do a work in it, not to establish Himself here. What more natural, then, than that, when once this work is accomplished, He should leave the world, in which He found Himself only for a special purpose, and should *return* to God His true home ? The ascension is the natural counterpart of the incarnation, and the divine future derives its light from the divine past. The symmetry of the four clauses of this verse throws an unexpected light on the history of Jesus and on each of the four great phases in which it is summed up : self-renunciation, incarnation, death, ascension. The expression *come forth from God* indicates the renouncing of the divine state, the divesting Himself of the *μορφή θεοῦ* (*the form of God*) according to the language of Paul (Phil. ii. 6) ; the : *come into the world*, the entrance into the human state and into the earthly existence, the : *being made flesh* (i. 14), or the : *taking the form of a servant* (Phil. ii. 7). The *leaving the world* does not indicate the abandoning of the human nature, but the rupture of the *earthly* form of human existence. For Stephen also beholds Jesus glorified in the form of the Son of man (Acts vii. 56), and it is as Son of man that Jesus reigns and comes again (Matt. xxvi. 64, Luke xviii. 8).—Finally, the *going to the Father* designates the exaltation of Jesus, in His human nature, to the divine state which He enjoyed as Logos before the incarnation.—The Alexandrian reading *ἐκ*, *out of*, has, as Lücke himself has remarked, a dogmatic savor which is of too pronounced a character to be the true one (comp. i. 18). *Παρά*, *from*, in the *Sinaitic MS.* and the other Mjj. includes, as in ver. 27, the two ideas of the *origin* and the *mission*.—Jesus here says *the Father*, in-

<sup>1</sup> Instead of *παρά* (*from*), B C L X 2 Mun. Cop. Orig. read *ἐκ* (*out of*).

stead of *God* (ver. 27). The question is no longer, indeed, of the contents of the apostolic faith, as in ver. 27. All the tenderness of His filial relation to the Father, which He has renounced, pictures itself to His thought. The term *πάλιν*, *again*, which might be translated by : *in return*, indicates the correlation between the coming and the departure ; it is as it were a : consequently ; for the one justifies the other. The apostles understand that if He *goes away*, it is because He has *come* ; and that if He goes *to God*, it is because He has come *from God*.

Vv. 29, 30. "*His disciples say to him,*<sup>1</sup> *Lo, now thou speakest plainly, and dost use no similitude ; 30, now we know that thou knowest all things and hast no need that any one should ask thee ; for this we believe that thou camest forth from God.*"—On hearing this simple and precise recapitulation of all the mysteries of His past, present and future existence, the disciples are, as it were, surrounded by an unexpected brightness ; a unanimous and spontaneous confession comes from their lips ; the doubts which were tormenting them from the beginning of their conversations are scattered ; it seems to them that they have nothing more to desire in the matter of illumination, and that they have already arrived at the day of that perfect knowledge which Jesus has just promised to them. Not that they have the folly to mean to affirm, contrary to the word of Him whose omniscience they are proclaiming at this very moment, that the time is already come which has just been promised them as yet to come ; but the light is so clear that they know not how to conceive of a more brilliant one. By answering so directly the thoughts which were agitating them in the centre of their hearts, Jesus has given them the measure of the truth of His words in general and of the certainty of all His promises. They have just had, like Nathanael at the beginning, experience of His omniscience, and, like him, they infer from it His divine character.—The relation of the words : *Thou hast no need that any one should ask thee*, to those of ver. 19 : *Jesus knew that they wished to ask him*, is beyond dispute ; only this relation must be understood in a broad sense and one worthy of this solemn scene (in answer to *Meyer*).—In the confession of the disciples, as in the expression *Son of God*, i. 50, the two ideas of divine mission (*ἀπό*) and origin (*ἐξῆλθε*) are mingled.

Vv. 31-33. "*Jesus answered them : Now you believe. 32. Behold, the hour is coming, and is now<sup>2</sup> come, when you shall be scattered every one to his own home, and when you shall leave me alone ; but I am not alone, because the Father is with me. 33. I have said these things to you, that in me you may have peace ; in the world you shall have<sup>3</sup> tribulation ; but be of good courage, I have overcome the world.*"—Here is for Jesus a moment of unutterable sweetness ; He is recognized and understood—He Jesus—by these eleven Galileans. This is for Him enough ; His work is for the moment ended ; the Holy Spirit will finish it by glorifying Him in them, and through them in mankind. There remains nothing further for Him but to close the conversation and give thanks. John alone understood the greatness

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  B C D A  $\Pi$  2 Mnn. It<sup>aliq</sup> reject  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ .

<sup>2</sup> Instead of  $\epsilon\chi\epsilon\tau\epsilon$  (*you shall have*) which T.

<sup>3</sup>  $\aleph$  A B C D L X Cop. omit  $\nu\nu\nu$  before  $\epsilon\lambda\eta\lambda\upsilon\theta\epsilon\nu$ .

R. reads with D some Mnn. It<sup>plurique</sup>,  $\epsilon\chi\epsilon\tau\epsilon$  (*you have*) is read in the other documents.

of this moment, and has preserved for us the remembrance of it. The words : *Now you believe*, must not therefore be understood in an interrogative, and in some sort ironical sense, as if Jesus would call in question the reality of their faith. I do not think even that *ἄρτι, now*, forms a contrast with the very near want of fidelity to which Jesus is about to allude, as if He would say : " True, you believe now ; but in a short time, how will you be acting ! " Could Jesus, in ch. xvii., give thanks to His Father with such outpouring of heart for a faith which He had just characterized in such a way ? Comp. especially xvii. 8 : "*They have known truly (ἀληθῶς) that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me,*" words in which Jesus certainly alludes to our ver. 30. The word *now*, therefore, seems to me rather to mean here : " Now at last you have reached the point to which I have been laboring to lead you : you have recognized me for what I am, and have received me as such. "—The connection in ver. 32 is not a *but* ; it is a simple *no doubt* ; in ver. 33 will be found the final *but* answering to this *no doubt*. This scarcely formed faith is about to be subjected, it is true, to a severe test ; the bond will be broken, at least externally. But the spiritual bond will remain firm and will triumph over this trial and all others.—The *νῦν, now*, which we have rendered by *already*, is omitted by the Alexandrian authorities ; it may have been rejected because it seemed that the moment indicated was not yet present.—The first aorist passive *σκορπισθήτε, you shall be scattered*, is more suited to extenuate than to aggravate the fault of the disciples ; it is, as it were, a violent blow which will strike and stun them. These words recall the quotation from Zechariah in the Synoptics : "*I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered*" (Matt. xxvii. 31). It is in the following words : "*you will leave me alone,*" that the idea of culpable desertion is expressed, but in the tone of sadness rather than of reproach.—"*Ἐκαστος εἰς ἰδία, each one to his own* ; each to his respective abode. *Weiss* finds in this expression the idea of the breaking off of the communion between them, as a sign of the shaking of their faith in the Messiah. It indicates rather the seeking of a secure shelter, far from the danger which touches their Master.—*Kaί*, evidently in the adversative sense : *and yet*.

Ver. 32 reassures the disciples as to the person of their Master ; ver. 33 tranquillizes them for themselves. Everything that Jesus has said to them on this last evening should breathe into them a complete quietness, resting upon the foundation of the faith which they have in Him (xiv. 1). No doubt, He could not conceal from them that they would have to sustain a struggle with the world (xv. 18—xvi. 4). But in the presence of the tribulations which this struggle will bring, it is necessary that their peace should take the character of *assurance* and become courage, *θάρσος*.—There is an opposition between the two limiting terms : *in me* and *in the world* ; the first designates the sphere from which peace is drawn ; the other, the domain whence anguish arises. *Ἐγώ, I*, brings out with force the unique personality of Him who, having already overcome for Himself, makes His victory that of His followers.—The *victory* which Jesus has already gained is, above all, internal ; He has resisted the attractions of the world

and surmounted its terrors. But there is more : this moral victory is about to be realized externally in the consummation of the redemptive work, on the cross accepted in advance, which will be henceforth the cause and the monument of the world's defeat. This victory will be continued by means of the Eleven, who will be the bearers of it here on earth.

THIRD SECTION.

XVII. 1-26.

THE PRAYER.

The shout of victory with which Jesus closed His conversations with the disciples was an anticipation of faith. To transform the victory which was announced into a present reality, nothing less was needed than the action of the omnipotence of God. It is to Him that Jesus turns.

This prayer is ordinarily divided into three parts : 1. The prayer for His own person, vv. 1-5 ; 2. The prayer for His apostles, vv. 6-19 ; and 3. The prayer for the Church, vv. 20-26. And this is indeed the course of the prayer. But the thought is one : when Jesus prays for Himself, it is not His own person that He has in view, it is *the work of God* (see on vv. 1, 2) ; when He prays for His apostles, He commends them to God as agents and continuers of this work ; and when He extends His regard to all believers present or future, it is as if to the *objects* of this work, in other terms because these souls are the theatre where the glory of His Father is to shine forth ; for His work and the glory of the Father are for Him one and the same thing. The framework of the prayer is accordingly that which is indicated by the generally adopted division, but the single thought is that of the work of Christ, or *the glory of the Father*. This prayer is thus throughout an inspiration of the filial heart of Jesus.

This prayer is more than a simple meditation. Jesus had *acted* (ch. xiii.) and *spoken* (chs. xiv.-xvi.) ; now He uses the form of language which is, at the same time, word and act : He *prays*. But He does not only pray, He prays aloud ; and this proves that, while speaking to God, He speaks also for those who surround Him ; not to show them how He prays, but to associate them in the intimate communion which He maintains with His Father, and to induce them to *pray with Him*. It is an anticipated realization of that communion in glory which He asks for them in ver. 24 : “ *That they may behold the glory which thou hast given me ; that where I am, they also may be with me.* ” He lifts them to the divine sphere where He Himself lives.

This prayer has been called *sacerdotal*. This is, indeed, the act of the High-Priest of mankind, who begins His sacrifice by offering Himself to God with all His people present and future.

Vv. 1-5 : Jesus asks again His divine glory.

Vv. 1, 2. “ *These things spoke<sup>1</sup> Jesus ; then he lifted up<sup>2</sup> his eyes to heaven*

<sup>1</sup> N : ἀελαλήκεν instead of ἐλάλησεν.

instead of ἐπῆρε . . . καὶ εἶπεν, which T. R. reads

<sup>2</sup> N B C D L X 7 Mnn. H<sup>ab</sup> Vulg. Cop. :

with A and 12 Mjj. H<sup>ab</sup> Syr.

εἶπας . . . εἶπεν (*having lifted up . . . he said*),

and said : *Father, the hour is come ; glorify thy Son, that thy Son<sup>1</sup> also<sup>2</sup> may glorify thee ; 2, as thou hast given<sup>3</sup> him power over all flesh, that to all those whom thou hast given him he should give<sup>4</sup> eternal life.*—If Jesus had uttered the preceding words on the way from Jerusalem to Gethsemane, He must now have been on the point of crossing the brook Cedron. At this decisive moment, He collects Himself and prays. — The words : *He spoke these things*, clearly distinguish the preceding discourses from the solemn act of prayer. This also is indicated by the lifting the eyes towards heaven. Until this point, Jesus had looked upon the disciples while speaking to them. To raise the eyes towards heaven is a natural effort of the soul to the end of escaping from the earthly prison, an aspiration after beholding the living God, whose glory is, above all, resplendent in the pure serenity of the heavens. No doubt this act can have taken place in a room (Acts vii. 55) ; but it is much more easily intelligible in the open air ; comp. xi. 41, Mark vii. 34. The words : *And he said*, mark the moment when, beyond the visible heaven, His heart met the face of God, and when in the God of the universe He beholds His Father. The Alexandrian reading : “*having lifted up his eyes, he said,*” is more flowing and more in the Greek style ; the received reading : “*he lifted up his eyes and said,*” is more simple and Hebraistic ; could this be a proof in favor of the first ? — The name *Father* expresses the spirit of the whole prayer which is to follow. Jesus certainly employed the Aramaic term *Abba* ; comp. Mark xiv. 36. This term, in which He was accustomed to concentrate the holiest emotions of His filial heart, became sacred to the Christians, and passed as such into the language of the New Testament, as the expression of the sentiment of divine adoption and filial adoration (Rom. viii. 15, Gal. iv. 6). — The *hour* is that of which John and Jesus Himself had said many times, in the course of this Gospel, that *it was not yet come* : it is that of His exaltation through death. But in order that it may result in the glorification of the Son, the intervention of the Father will be necessary ; this is what Jesus asks for by the word : *Glorify!* Some explain this glorification of Jesus by the *moral perfection* which, with the divine aid, He will cause to shine forth in His sufferings, and by the *attractive power* which He will thus exercise over the hearts of men. These explanations are, as *Reuss* acknowledges, incompatible with ver. 5, where we see beyond question that Jesus is thinking of His *personal* reinstatement in the divine state which He had had before His incarnation. Only it is not necessary to restrict this glory which Jesus asks again—as the orthodox interpreters in general suppose—to the enjoyment of divine blessedness and glory. For the aim of this request of Jesus is not His own satisfaction, but the continuation and finishing of His work, as is shown by the following words : *that thy Son may glorify thee*. What He desires is new means of action. He asks consequently for the restoration to His complete divine state, the possession of the divine omnipresence, omniscience and

<sup>1</sup> Ⲛ B C It<sup>alg</sup> omit σου after υἱος (*the son*, instead of *thy son*).

<sup>2</sup> Ⲛ A B C D 3 Mm. It<sup>trique</sup> Vulg. Syr. Cop. Orig. omit και (*also*) after εἶνα.

<sup>3</sup> Alex. : δεδωκας instead of εδωκας (this vari-

ant is almost constantly repeated throughout this passage).

<sup>4</sup> Instead of δωση αυτοις (T. R. with 7 Mj), 9 Mj (B E H etc.) : δωσει αυτοις ; Ⲛ : δωσω αυτω.

omnipotence of which He had divested Himself in order to appropriate to Himself a true human state. He cannot continue to glorify God and to develop the work of salvation, the foundation of which is now laid, except on this condition. His personal state must be transformed quite as much as it was transformed when Jesus passed from the divine state to the human existence. He speaks of Himself in the third person : *thy Son*. This is what we always do when we wish to draw the attention of the one to whom we address ourselves to what we are *for him*. There is nothing suspicious, therefore, in this manner of speaking which John attributes to Jesus. It is, moreover, in conformity with the ordinary manner in which He speaks of Himself in the Synoptics, where He habitually designates Himself by the title : the Son of man. What would be more justly open to suspicion, would be the form presented by the Alexandrian reading, which is adopted by *Tischendorf* and defended by *Weiss* and *Westcott* : "that the Son may glorify thee." Instead of expressing the filial feeling of Jesus, as the received text "*thy Son*" does, this reading has a purely dogmatic tinge, precisely as in the analogous passages i. 18 and xvi. 28. — The particle *kai* after *iva*, "that also," is omitted by the Alexandrian authorities and is rejected by *Tischendorf*, etc. But this little word may easily have been omitted. It brings out well the relation between the glorification of the Father by the Son and that of the Son by the Father, and consequently the filial spirit which animates this petition : Jesus wishes to be glorified by His Father only that He may be able *in His turn* to glorify Him.

Ver. 2 is an explanatory annex to ver. 1. Jesus reminds the Father of that which gives Him the right to say to Him : *Glorify me!* In praying thus, He acts only in conformity with the decree of God Himself : *As thou hast given him power*. This gift consists in the decree by which God conferred the sovereignty over the whole human race (*all flesh*) upon the Son, when He sent Him to fulfil here on earth His mission of Saviour (x. 36) ; comp. Eph. i. 10. — The work of salvation which He has to fulfil in the midst of mankind has indeed as its condition the position of Lord ; comp. Matt. xxviii. 18 : "All power has been given to me," a passage in which the sovereignty which has been gained serves as a basis for the command to teach and baptize all the nations—that is to say, to take possession of them. — The second clause : *that he may give life*, is parallel to the second clause of ver. 1 : *that he may glorify thee*. The true means of glorifying God is to communicate eternal life—that is to say, to associate men with the life of God. In presenting the aim of His petition under this new aspect, Jesus therefore gives the ground for it in a different way. His petition is equivalent to saying : "Grant me the Ascension, that I may be able to bring to pass the Pentecost." For it is through the gift of the Holy Spirit that Jesus communicates life to believers (vii. 37-39). *Weiss* does not recognize this relation, which is so simple, between the life and the Spirit, and wishes to see here only the *extension* of the action of Jesus to the whole world.— *Πάν*, all, designates the future body of believers, that unity, that *év* (of which ver. 33, xi. 52, Eph. ii. 14, speak) which God has eternally completed and given to the Son (Rom. viii. 28). The word *πᾶν* is a nominative absolute ;

comp. vi. 39. Afterwards, the same idea is taken up again and placed in its regular case in the limiting word *αὐτοῖς*, to them. This plural pronoun individualizes the contents of the totality, which is the object of the gift. For if the gift made by God to Christ is a collective act including every one who believes, the communication of life by Christ to believers is an individual fact.—The term : *that which thou hast given him*, recalls the expressions of ch. vi : “those whom the Father teaches, draws, gives to the Son” (vv. 37, 44, 45, 65) ; they are those whom the influence of the law and prophecy lead with eagerness for salvation to the feet of Jesus.—The form *δώσει* is not Greek ; it recurs, however, in Apoc. viii. 3 and xiii. 16 in some MSS. We must see in it either a future subjunctive, a later form of which some examples, it is thought, are found in the New Testament (*Bäumlein* cites *ὑψηθε*, Luke xiii. 28 ; *καυθήσωμαι*, 1 Cor. xiii. 3 ; *κερδηθήσονται*, 1 Pet. iii. 1 ; *εἰρήνης*, Apoc. xviii. 14) ; or may it be the subjunctive of an incorrect aorist *ἔδωσα*, instead of *ἔδωκα* ? It would indeed have been difficult to say *δῶκη*. But the true reading is perhaps *δώσει* (*Vatic.*), of which it was thought a subjunctive must be made because of the *iva* (comp. the reading *γινώσκωσι* in ver. 3). The reading *δώσω* in the *Sinaitic* MS. is incompatible with the third person used throughout the whole passage. The reading *αὐτῷ*, to it (the *πάν*), in the same MS., is also an evident correction.—The meaning of the expression : *all that which thou hast given him*, is less extensive than that of the term *all flesh* ; it refers only to believers. If Jesus has received power over every man living, it is with reference to *believers* whom it is His mission to save. Comp. Eph. i. 22 : “He has given Him to the Church as head over all things,” that is to say, as its head, who, at the same time, is on its behalf established over all things.

Ver. 3 establishes the connection between the idea of *glorifying God* (ver. 1) and that of *giving eternal life* (ver. 2) : to live is to know God ; to glorify God is, accordingly, to give life by giving the knowledge of Him.

Ver. 3. “*Now this is eternal life, that they should know thee, the only true God, and him whom thou has sent, Jesus Christ.*”—Jesus contemplates that eternal life in which He is to make mankind participate ; He fathoms the essence of it ; it is the *knowledge* of God. Such a knowledge is certainly not, in His thought, a purely rational fact. The Scriptures always take the word *know* in a more profound sense. When the question is of the relation between two persons, this word designates the perfect intuition which each has of the moral being of the other, their intimate meeting together in the same luminous medium. Jesus has described in xiv. 21–23 the revealing act from which there will result for His own this only real knowledge of God. It is the work of the Spirit, making Jesus, and with Him God, dwell in us.—The epithet *only* neither refers, as *Luthardt* says, to the word *true*, nor to the word *God*, but to the entire phrase *true God*. The term *ἀληθινός*, *true*, declares that this God is the only one who answers perfectly to the idea expressed by the word *God*. How is it possible not to find here, with *Meyer*, the contrast to manifold divinities and divinities unworthy of this name which appertained to the reigning polytheism ? I do

not see how *Weiss* can refuse to admit this tacit antithesis. It suits precisely the idea of the extension of Christ's action beyond the limits of Israel, which is, according to him, the idea of ver. 2. Does not the word *all flesh* call up the image of all these peoples foreign to Israel, which compose the idolatrous portion of mankind?—But *Meyer* is certainly mistaken in making the words : *the only true God*, the attribute of *σέ, thee* : “recognize thee as the only. . . .” In this construction the word *know* takes a meaning too intellectual and one contrary to the part here ascribed to the knowledge as being one with the life itself. The expression : the only true God, is appositional with *σέ* : “to know thee, thyself, the only true God.” Thus the word *to know* preserves the profound and living sense which it should have. This does not at all exclude the contrast with polytheism indicated above.

If Jesus had prayed only with a view to Himself, He would have limited Himself to these words : “*That they should know thee, the only true God.*” But He prays aloud, and consequently associating in His prayer those who surround Him. This is the reason why He adds : “*and him whom thou hast sent, Jesus Christ.*” While rendering homage to God, as the first source of eternal life, He has the consciousness of being Himself the sole intermediate agent through whom those who listen to Him can have access to this source ; for it is in Him that God manifests and gives Himself (xiv. 6). The possession of eternal life is identified therefore in His view, for all that is called man, with the knowledge of Himself, Jesus, as well as with that of God. Since *Augustine*, some interpreters (*Lampe*, etc.) have made the words “(*him*) whom thou hast sent,” etc., a second apposition to *σέ, thee*. The aim of this impossible construction is evidently to save the divinity of Christ ; but this is exposed to no danger with the natural construction. The words : “*Him whom thou hast sent,*” are certainly the object of the verb *that they should know*. No more need we make the word *Christ* the attribute of *Jesus* : “that they should know Jesus whom thou hast sent as the Christ ;” this construction would bring us back to the intellectual sense of the word *know*. The words *Jesus Christ* are in apposition with the object, *him whom thou hast sent*. But we need not unite them in one single proper name, in conformity with the later use of this phrase, as *Weiss*, *Reuss* and some others do, who see in such an expression, which could not, as they say, be placed in the mouth of Jesus Himself, a proof of the freedom with which the evangelist has reproduced this prayer. *Tholuck* also finds here a coming in of the later ecclesiastical language ; even *Westcott* regards these words, as well as the preceding ones : *the only true God*, as glosses due to the evangelist who is explaining the Master's prayer—an explanation which is indeed certainly superfluous. *Bretschneider* is the one who has most severely criticised this form ; he sees in it a gross historical impropriety from which he derives a proof against the authenticity of the Gospel. We think that this objection, on the contrary, springs from the fact that one does not place himself, in a sufficiently living way, in the historical situation in which this prayer was uttered. Until now, Jesus had always avoided assuming before the people the title of *Christ*. Rather

than use this term, subject to so many misapprehensions, when the ordinary designation *Son of man* was not sufficient, He had had recourse to more strange circumlocutions (viii. 24, x. 25 ff.). He had acted in the same way in the circle of His disciples (xiii. 13, 19). Once only, and by way of exception, in Samaria, on non-Jewish ground, He had openly assumed the title of Messiah (iv. 26). In the Synoptics, He conducts Himself in the same way. Matt. xvi. 20, while accepting Peter's confession, He takes occasion to forbid the disciples to designate Him publicly as the Christ. This reticence must not continue to the end. And since the moment was come when the new word of command for mankind, *Jesus Messiah*, was to be proclaimed throughout the whole earth by the apostles, it was necessary that once at least they should hear it coming expressly from the lips of their Master Himself. And under what more favorable circumstances and in what more solemn form could this watchword of the new religion be proclaimed than in this last conversation with His Father, which was setting the seal upon His whole work? This is what Jesus does in this solemn formula: *Jeschouah hammaschiach (Jesus Messiah)*. John has not therefore committed an inadvertence here. He has faithfully reproduced this inexpressibly serious and thrilling moment, when he heard Jesus Himself, by this declaration, explicitly sanction at last the faith which had not ceased to develop itself within him since the day when he for the first time drew near to Jesus (i. 42)—that faith which he and his colleagues had henceforth the mission of preaching to the world. Would to God that all the confessions of faith, throughout the Church, had always been, like this, acts of adoration!—It has been objected that the word *Χριστόν*, without the article, can only be regarded as a proper name. But comp. ix. 22, where John says, "If any one confessed him as the Christ," without using the article. As to i. 17, we have there the technical form indeed, but as a reproduction by the pen of the evangelist of the more living form which is found in our prayer.—This second clause of the verse separates the new religion from Judaism, as the first does from Paganism.—The Arians and Socinians have combated the divinity of Jesus Christ by means of this verse in which Jesus is placed beside and apart from the only true God. But John takes the same course in speaking of the Logos, i. 1. No one is more express in his statements of subordination than John. And yet, at the same time, no one teaches more distinctly the participation of Jesus, as the Word, in the Divine nature. In this very verse Jesus is presented as the *object*, and not only as the *intermediate agent*, of the knowledge which is eternal life. How could the knowledge of a creature be the life of the human soul?—The conjunction *ὡς, that*, is used here rather than *ὅτι*, because this knowledge is presented as an *end* to be reached, the supreme good to be obtained.—After this outpouring, Jesus returns to the prayer of ver. 1; He presents to God in a new form the same ground to justify the petition: *Glorify me!* He insists on all that He, Jesus, has already done, to establish on the earth this twofold knowledge which is eternal life, and on the actual necessity of a change in His position in order to finish this divine work (vv. 4, 5).

Vv. 4, 5. "*I have glorified thee on the earth; I have accomplished the work which thou hast given me to do.* 5. *And now, Father, glorify thou me, with thyself, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.*"—After having thus described the life which He desires to communicate to the world, Jesus returns to His request: *Glorify me*, in ver. 1. He has founded this request on what He is to do in the future; He now justifies it by what He has already done hitherto. As far as He has been able to do it here below, in His earthly condition, He has *glorified* God. He has caused His holy and good character to shine in the hearts of men. But to do more than this, He must have a new position, with new means of activity. It is thus that in ver. 4 the way is prepared for the repetition of His petition in ver. 5.—The Alexandrian reading *τελειώσας*, *having accomplished*, seems to me much more after the Greek than the Hebrew style,—in other terms, much more Alexandrian than apostolic. The juxtaposition of the two verbs in the T. R. is therefore, in my view, preferable to their syntactic fitting to each other in the other text.—The words: "*I have accomplished the work,*" express with a sublime candor the feeling of a perfectly pure conscience. He does not perceive in His life, at this supreme moment, either any evil committed or even any good omitted. The duty of every hour has been perfectly fulfilled. There has been in this human life which He has now behind Him, not only no spot, but no deficiency with reference to the task of making the divine perfection shine forth resplendently.

Ver. 5. The most potent means of action of which He has need in order to continue this task, He can only obtain by recovering His state anterior to the incarnation. And this is the purpose for which He asks it again. There cannot be any temerity on His part in doing this, since this state of divine glory appertains to His nature, and He has voluntarily renounced it in order to serve God here on earth.—By the words: *with thyself*, Jesus opposes the divine sphere to that in which He is at present living (*on the earth*, ver. 4.), xiii. 32.—The expression: *the glory which I had*, is opposed to His present humiliation. No doubt, in His human state He has also a glory, even a glory "as that of the only begotten Son having come from the Father" (i. 14). But it differs from His heavenly glory as the dependent form of the human existence differs from the autonomous form of the divine existence. This filial position in relation to God, which He has as man, is only a reflection of the filial position which He has had as God. *Reuss* thinks that this verse does not imply absolute pre-existence, eternity, but only a certain priority with relation to the world. But from the biblical point of view, the *world* embraces all that appertains to the sphere of *becoming*, and beyond this sphere there is only *being*, eternity. Comp. the opposition between *γίνεσθαι* and *εἶναι*, i. 1, 3, viii. 58, and Ps. xc. 2.—*Παρὰ σοί*, *with thee*, cannot have the purely *ideal* sense which the Socinians give to it, and which now again *Beyschlag*<sup>2</sup> and *Sabatier* endeavor to maintain in somewhat different forms. This theory does violence to John's terms no

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  A B C L II 5 Mnn. Italic Syr. Cop.: *τελειώσας* (*having accomplished*) instead of *ετέλειωσα*.

<sup>2</sup> *Beyschlag* at present appears to me to modify his point of view and to adopt two contradictory theories in our Gospel.

less than to those of Paul (Phil. ii. 6-11). He who says, *I had . . . with thee*, emphasizes His own personality previous to the incarnation, no less than that of God (ver. 24). The *I* who asks for the glory is the one who has had it. It is equally impossible to find here the least trace of the idea which Sabatier finds in the passage of Paul (Phil.),—that of a progress from the glory of Christ before His earthly life to His glory afterwards. The only difference between these two conditions is that this latter glory is possessed by Him even in His humanity, elevated to the sphere of the divine existence (Acts vii. 55, Matt. xxvi. 64, where the term *Son of man* is still applied to the glorified Christ). See on viii. 58.—From the fact that Jesus says: *before the world was*, and not “before *I came* into the world,” Schelling<sup>1</sup> concluded that the humiliation of the Logos began from the time of the creation, and not only with the incarnation. This conclusion is not well founded exegetically. For Jesus only means here to oppose this glory to a glory which may have had some sort of beginning in time.

Vv. 6-19: Jesus asks for the support of His apostles in faith and their full consecration to the divine work.

It seems to me that it is altogether wrong for Weiss, with Lücke, de Wette, etc., to connect the passage, vv. 6-8, with what precedes, as developing the work of Christ on the earth, and as still intended to give a ground for the first petition: *glorify me*. The question henceforth is rather of what the disciples have become through the work of Christ, to the end of giving a ground for the prayer on their behalf (ver. 9). As it is with a view to the work of God that He asks His own glory again, it is also in view of this work that He commends to His Father the instruments whom He has chosen and prepared for the purpose of continuing it. This prayer has first an altogether general character: *I pray for them*, ver. 9; then it is given, with precision and in form, in two distinct petitions: *τήρησον*, *keep them* (ver. 11), and *ἀγιάσον*, *sanctify them* (ver. 17), which are the counterpart of the *δοξασόν με*, *glorify me*, for Jesus Himself. Vv. 6-8 prepare the way for the first general petition, for which vv. 9, 10 will finally give the grounds.

Vv. 6-8. “*I have manifested thy name to the men whom thou hast given<sup>2</sup> me out of the world; thine they were, and thou hast given them to me; and they have kept<sup>3</sup> thy word. 7. Now they have known<sup>4</sup> that all that thou hast given me is from thee. 8. For the words which thou hast given me I have given them; and they have received them, and they have known<sup>5</sup> truly that I came forth from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me.*”—The general idea expressed in these words is that of the *worth* which the apostles have acquired by the ministry of Jesus among them and by the success of this work. Thus is the way prepared for the prayer by which Jesus is about to commend them to the care of the Father. And first, what Jesus has done for them. The aorist *ἐφάνησα*, *I have manifested*, is connected with the similar aorists in ver. 4. The most important portion of the work which Jesus felicitates Himself in

<sup>1</sup> In his oral courses.

<sup>2</sup> Here, as elsewhere, the Alexandrian authorities read *έδωκας* instead of *δέδωκας*.

<sup>3</sup> *Ν*: *ετηρησαν*, instead of *ετηρηκασι* (B D L:

*ετηρηκαν*).

<sup>4</sup> *Ν*: *εγνωσιν*, instead of *εγνωσαν*.

<sup>5</sup> *Και εγνωσαν* is omitted by *Ν A D It<sup>2</sup>liq.*

having accomplished (ver. 4) was precisely the preparation and education of these eleven persons.—The *name of God*, which He has revealed to them, designates the divine character fully manifested to the consciousness of Jesus Himself, and through Him to the disciples in proportion as the consciousness of their Master has become their own (Matt. xi. 25, 26). It is by revealing Himself as Son, that Jesus has revealed God to them as the Father. This is the reason why He must necessarily testify of Himself, as He does in the Fourth Gospel ; it was an essential element of His teaching respecting God.—After having recalled His labor on their behalf, Jesus recalls to the Father what He has Himself done for them. The apostles were *His*, and He has given them to Jesus. The question here is not of what they were as men and as Jews, but of the relation which they sustained to God through their inward disposition, as faithful Jews ; comp. the expressions : *to be of God* (vii. 17, viii. 47), *to be of the truth* (xviii. 37), *to do the truth* (iii. 21). These expressions designate the moral state of the Israelites or heathen who adhere to the light of the law or of conscience. These beings who belong to God, God has led to Jesus by the inward drawing or teaching of which He has spoken in vi. 37, 44, 45, 65. And He possesses them now as gifts of the Father.—Then, to what God and Jesus have done for the disciples, Jesus adds what the disciples have themselves done. This gift of themselves, once accomplished, they have faithfully maintained. Notwithstanding all the temptations to unfaithfulness which have assailed them during these years (Luke xxii. 28), they have kept in their heart the teaching of Jesus. They have preserved intact and pure from all alloy this *name of God* imprinted by Him upon their consciousness. The words “*thy word*,” instead of “*my word*,” are explained in ver. 7 : the word of Jesus has been only a reproduction of that of the Father. Finally, Jesus sets before the Father all that which the disciples have become through this communication which He has made to them of His Word. They have discerned its divine origin, and they have received it in this character. There is at the first glance a tautology in the two expressions : *which thou hast given me*, and : *is thine*. But the first is derived from the consciousness of Jesus ; the second is borrowed from that of the apostles : “They have recognized that all which I gave them from thee came really from thee.” It is, that in fact (ver. 8.) Jesus never added anything to it from His own resources. Then, from the recognition of the absolutely divine character of His word, they are raised finally to the faith in the divine origin of His person (*I came forth*) and His mission (*thou hast sent me*). In these words there breathes also the feeling of inward joy and lively recognition which Jesus has just experienced a few moments before : for it is very recently that this result for which He blesses the Father at this moment has been obtained (xvi. 29-31). The harvest seems scanty, no doubt : eleven Galilean artisans after three years of labor ! But this is enough for Jesus : for in these eleven He beholds the pledge of the continuance of the divine work on the earth.—There is an advance in the three verbs of these two verses : “*They have known* :” on the authority of their consciousness ; “*they have received* :” by submission to this testimony ; “*they have believed* :” by the surrender of

their whole being to Him who thus manifested to them His divine character. The forms ἐγώκααν, τετήρηκααν, are Alexandrian, and the question to be determined is, as in so many other similar cases, whether the apostles themselves used them or whether they were introduced by the Alexandrian copyists.—After having thus prepared the way for His petition, Jesus utters it, and ends by giving the ground of it :

Vv. 9, 10. “*I pray for them ; I pray not for the world, but for those whom thou hast given me, because they are thine.* 10. *And all that which is mine is thine, and that which is thine is mine,<sup>1</sup> and I am glorified in them.*”—From the infinite value which these antecedents give to the person of the disciples, Jesus draws this conclusion : “*I pray for them.*” Ἐγώ, *I*, at the beginning : “*I*, who have labored so much to bring them to this point and to whom they now belong.” Then, immediately afterwards, and before the verb, the limiting words περὶ αὐτῶν, *for them* : “*For them*, this fruit of my labors, this present which thou hast made to me.” This general prayer is equivalent to an : “*I commend them to thee.*” Thus is the antithesis explained : *I pray not for the world.* Jesus has not the same grounds for commending the world to God ; if He wished to pray here for the world, He would formulate His petitions on its behalf quite differently. Luther rightly says : “*What must be asked for the world is that it should be converted, not that it should be kept or sanctified.*” Assuredly the refusal of Jesus to pray for the world is not absolute. He Himself says on the cross : “*Father, forgive them !*” Is not this to pray for the world ? Only He does not, as here, allege this ground : *They have known* (ver. 8) ; He says, on the contrary, “*For they know not what they do.*” He cannot make an appeal to God for the world, as for a precious being which belongs to Him, as He does here for His disciples. All that He can do on the cross is to make an appeal to His compassion towards a being who is guilty and is lost. Moreover, the words of ver. 21 : “*That the world may know that thou hast sent me,*” contain also an implicit prayer on behalf of the world. Comp. iii. 16. The refusal of Jesus to pray for the world becomes absolute only when its moral character of opposition to God is irrevocably fixed, and when it has become the society “*of those who not only are enemies of God, but who desire to remain such*” (*Gess*).—Before expressing the more special petitions included in this general prayer, Jesus presents again the two principal claims which the disciples have to the divine interest : 1. God has Himself given them to Jesus, and He must keep this gift for Him. Still more, by thus becoming the property of Jesus, they have not ceased to be that of God. For all property is common between them, and this bond connecting them with Jesus strengthens forever that which bound them to God. Would a mere creature express himself in this way ? Luther says : “*Every man can say, What I have is thine ; but the Son alone can say, What is thine is mine.*” The present, “*are thine,*” is purposely substituted for the imperfect, “*were thine,*” ver. 6, in order to express the idea that the gift made to Jesus has only served to confirm their *belonging to God.* 2.

<sup>1</sup> Instead of καὶ τὰ ἐμα . . . σα ἐμα, Ἔ reads καὶ ἐμοὶ αὐτοὺς εἶδικας.

The second ground which commends them henceforth to the Father's interest is, that they are become the depositaries of the glory of the Son (perfect, *δεδοξασμαι*). We must not make this clause depend on the *ἔτι* of ver. 9, which would render the sentence dragging, and would force us to make a parenthesis of the first part of ver. 10.—The expression : *I am glorified in them*, has been understood in different ways. There is no reason to depart from the constant sense of the term : *to be glorified*. Notwithstanding His form of servant, Jesus has been manifested to them inwardly in His divine character ; even before having been restored to His glory, He has regained it within them by the fact that they have recognized Him as the Son of God. This is the testimony which Jesus has borne to them, vv. 7, 8.—With this general commendation there are connected two more precise petitions. The first : *keep them*, is prepared for by ver. 11a, expressly stated ver. 11b, and supported by reasons vv. 12-15.

Ver. 11. “ *And I am no more in the world ; but they<sup>1</sup> are in the world ; and I come to thee. Holy Father, keep them in thy name, them whom<sup>2</sup> thou hast given me, that they may be one, as<sup>3</sup> we are.*”—At the moment of asking God more specially for His protection for His disciples, the thought of Jesus naturally turns towards the dangers to which they will be exposed in the state of desertion in which His departure is about to leave them : “ *Keep them, these precious vessels (vv. 6-10), which are from this moment so exposed (vv. 11-15).*” Jesus is no longer with them, in the world, to keep them, and He is not yet with God so as to be able to protect them from the midst of His heavenly glory. There is a sorrowful interval, during which His Father must charge Himself with this care. This reason would be absolutely incomprehensible, if the Fourth Gospel really taught, as *Reuss* thinks, that the Logos is susceptible neither of humiliation nor of exaltation, or, as *Baur* affirms, that death is for Him only the divesting of bodily appearances. Ver. 5 has proved that, when once His divine state is abandoned, there remains for Him, as a mode of existence, only His earthly presence with His own, and vv. 11, 12 prove that, when this presence comes to an end, there is nothing else to do for them except to lay them in the arms of the Father. *Weiss* thinks that even in His state of exaltation He will do nothing except through asking it of the Father. The passages which he alleges do not seem to me to prove this (xiv. 13, 16) ; and this idea is in direct contradiction to Matt. xxviii. 20.

The title : *Holy Father*, must be used in connection with the petition presented. Holiness, in man, is the consecration of his whole being to the task which the divine will assigns to him. Holiness, in God, is the free, deliberate, calm, immutable affirmation of Himself who is the good, or of the good which is Himself. The holiness of God, therefore, as soon as we are associated therewith, draws a deep line of demarcation between us and the men who live under the sway of their natural instincts, and whom the

<sup>1</sup> *Σ* B read *αυτοι* instead of *ουτοι*.

<sup>2</sup> T. R. with *Mun.* only *It<sup>1113</sup> Vulg. Cop.* reads *ους* (*those whom*) ; *Σ A B C E G H K L M S Y Γ Δ Δ II* some *Mun.* : *ω* (*which*) ; *D U X*

<sup>11</sup> *Mun. Syr.* : *ο* (*which*) *I<sup>11</sup>erique* omits all from *ω* (*ους*) to *ημεις*.

<sup>3</sup> *B M S U Y 12 Mun.* read *και* after *καθως*.

Scriptures call *the world*. The term : *Holy Father*, here characterizes God as the one who has drawn this line of separation between the disciples and the world. And the petition : *keep them*, has in view the maintenance of this separation. Jesus supplicates His Father to keep the disciples in this sphere of consecration, which is foreign to the life of the world, and of which God is Himself the centre and the author. The words : *in thy name*, make the relation of the divine character which is granted to the apostles as it were the inclosing wall of this sacred domain in which they are to be kept.—The reading which nearly all the Mjj. present would signify : “in thy name *which* thou hast given me.” But where in the Scriptures is the name of God spoken of as given to the Son ? The expression : “*My name is in him*” (Exod. xxiii. 21), is very different. I do not accept this reading even though it is so strongly supported ; comp. ver. 12, where it is even far more improbable. Since the received reading : *those whom* (οὓς) thou hast given me, has in its favor only Mnn., I think that the reading ὁ δέδωκας, “*that which* thou hast given me,” must be preferred, which is preserved in the *Cambridge MS.*, but that we must make these words the explanatory apposition of αὐτοῖς, *them*, which precedes ; it is the reverse construction of that in ver. 2, where the plural αὐτοῖς is the explanatory apposition of the singular πᾶν. Comp. also ver. 24 (in case the reading ὁ for οὓς must be adopted in that verse) : “Keep them in my name, *them, that which* thou hast given me.” This reading gives the same sense as that of the T. R. (οὓς) ; and it easily explains the origin of the Alexandrian reading (ὃ substituted for ὁ which was referred to ὀνόματι). The conjunction *that* may depend either on δέδωκας, or, what is the only possible meaning with the reading which we prefer, on *keep them* : “Keep them in the sphere of thy knowledge (those whom thou hast given to me to introduce into it), that they may remain one as we are, and that no one of them may be lost in isolation by means of the rupture of the bundle which my care had formed.” What indeed would have become of Thomas if, after the resurrection, he had persisted in keeping himself separated from his brethren ?—The words *as we are* signify that, as it is by the common possession of the divine nature that the Father and the Son are one, it is by the common knowledge of this nature (*the name*), that the disciples may remain closely united among themselves and may each one of them be individually kept.

Vv. 12, 13. “*When I was with them,*<sup>1</sup> *I kept them in thy name ; those whom*<sup>2</sup> *thou hast given me, I have watched over ; and none of them is lost, except the son of perdition, that the Scripture might be fulfilled. 13. But now, I come to thee ; and I say these things while I am in the world, that they may have my joy fulfilled in themselves.*”—Vv. 12–15 justify the petition : *Keep them*, by developing the ground of it, as it had been briefly indicated in ver. 11a : They have need of thy protection.—“*When I was with them,*” resumes

<sup>1</sup> T. R. reads here, with 14 Mjj. (A X Y etc.) εν τῷ κόσμῳ (*in the world*), which B C D L It. Cop. omit.

<sup>2</sup> Instead of οὓς (*those whom*) which T. R.

reads, with 15 Mjj. (Σ A D etc.), It. Syr. B C L read ω (*which*). They add και before εφυλαξα. Σ reads και εφυλασσον instead of οὓς δεδωκας . . . εφυλαξα.

the idea of : *I am no more . . .* (ver. 11). The words of the T. R. : *in the world*, are probably a gloss.—The *ἐγώ*, *I*, contrasts Him who has kept them hitherto with Him who is to do it for the future. The *ἐτήρουν*, *I kept them*, indicates the result obtained (*conseruabam*) ; the *ἐφύλαξα*, *I have guarded*, relates to the action put forth for this end (*eustodivēi*).—The reading *ὁ* is still more inadmissible in this verse than in the preceding. It has only three Mjj. in its favor, instead of sixteen in ver. 11. The reading *ο* is also abandoned by the three Mjj. which supported it, and has here in its favor only the Egyptian Versions. It only remains to read *οἱς* (*those whom*), with the T. R. and the majority of the Mjj., which suits the meaning of ver. 11.—By the word *son of perdition* and the citation of the prophecy, Jesus discharges Himself from responsibility, without lessening that of Judas. As to the latter, he has freely yielded himself to play the part traced out beforehand by the prophecy. We may compare here what is foretold concerning Antichrist. We know through prophecy that this person will exist, and yet this fact will not prevent the man who shall accept this part from freely doing so. Comp. p. 235, the remarks on the relation between the divine foreknowledge and human freedom. In the Hebraistic phrase *son of* the abstract complement indicates the moral principle which determines the tendency of the individual thus designated. The passage of which Jesus is thinking is Ps. xli. 10, cited in xiii. 18. Must we conclude from the expression *εἰ μή*, *if it is not*, that Jesus counted Judas also in the number of those *whom the Father had previously given Him* ? I do not think that this form of expression obliges us to draw this conclusion ; comp. Matt. xii. 4, Luke iv. 26, 27, etc.

This remark was a parenthesis intended to justify, with regard to the loss of Judas, the watchfulness of the Lord. After this Jesus returns (ver. 13) to the idea of His approaching departure ; this is the fact which gives the ground for His petition. And He adds that, if He *utters aloud* (this is the meaning of *λαλῶ*) these words in presence of His disciples, before leaving them, it is that He may associate them in the joy which He Himself enjoys. This joy is that which is inspired in Him by the certainty of the protection with which the Father shelters Him at all times, a certainty which is also to become theirs.—The need which they have of being kept is set forth in the following words in a still more pressing way than before. They are not only going to remain *alone* in the world, but as objects of its *hatred*.

Vv. 14, 15. “*I have given them thy word ; and the world has hated them, because they are not of the world, as I am not of the world. 15. I ask not that thou shouldst take them out of the world, but that thou shouldst keep them from the evil.*”—The word of Jesus, which they have faithfully received, has made them strangers in the world, as Jesus Himself was. They are become thereby, like Him, beings antipathetic to purely earthly humanity. Jesus might therefore easily allow Himself to ask of God to withdraw them from the world with Himself. But no ; for He has separated them from the world for the precise purpose of preparing them to fulfil a mission to the world. It is necessary that they should remain here to fulfil this task ; only it must not be that the line of demarcation which He has succeeded in

drawing between the world and them, by placing His word in them, should be effaced. While remaining in the world, they must be *kept from the evil* which reigns therein. Jesus thus closes this passage by presenting again the petition which was its text. The limiting word τοῦ πονηροῦ, it seems to me, must be taken here in the neuter sense : *from the evil*, and not : *from the evil one* ; for the preposition ἐκ, *out of*, refers rather to a *domain*, from the midst of which one is taken, than to a person from whose power one escapes. It is otherwise in the Lord's Prayer, where the preposition ἀπό and the verb ῥιψῆσθαι are used, two expressions which rather refer to a *personal enemy* (Matt. vi. 13). It is wrong, therefore, for *Reuss, Weiss*, etc., to explain here : "*from the power of the devil.*" *Hengstenberg* observes that the form τηρεῖν ἐκ does not appear again except in the Apoc. (iii. 10).—From the prayer : *Keep them*, which has rather a negative aim (to prevent their return to the world), and which especially refers to their own salvation, Jesus passes to the second petition, which has a positive end in view, and which refers rather to their mission : *Sanctify them*. It is prepared for in ver. 16, stated in ver. 17, then justified and developed in vv. 18, 19.

Vv. 16, 17. "*They are not of the world, as I am not of the world. Sanctify them by thy truth ;<sup>1</sup> thy word is truth.*"<sup>2</sup>—Ver. 16 is the transition from the first petition to the second. Jesus has introduced them into the sphere of holiness in which He Himself lives ; but it is not only necessary that they should abide there (*keep them*) ; they must also penetrate farther therein, that they may be strengthened ; for they have the mission to introduce the world into it.—*Ἀγιασῶν, sanctify* : this word does not merely designate their own moral perfection (*Lücke, de Wette*), but also the consecration of their whole life to the service of God's work (ver. 18). According to x. 36, a consecration preceded the sending of Jesus to the earth : "*me whom the Father has sanctified and sent into the world.*" He was marked with a seal of holiness that He might establish here on earth the kingdom of holiness. The same thing is to be repeated for His disciples. The word ἀγιάζειν, *to sanctify*, is not synonymous with καθαρίζειν, *to purify*. *Holy* is not the opposite of *impure*, but simply of *natural* or *profane* (without the idea of defilement). To sanctify is to consecrate to a religious use what hitherto had appertained to the common life, without the idea of sin. Comp. Exod. xl. 13, Levit. xxii. 2, 3, and Matt. xxiii. 17 : "*Which is greater, the gold or the temple which sanctifies the gold ?*" But from the Old Testament point of view, the consecration was an external, ritual act ; in the new covenant, where all is spiritual, the seat of consecration is above all the heart, the will of the consecrated person. Jesus, therefore, in saying *Sanctify them*, asks for them a will entirely devoted to the good—that is, to God and to His service, and consequently to the task which God gives them to discharge in the world. All their forces, all their talents, all their life, are to be marked with the seal of consecration to this great work, the salvation of men ; a thing which implies the renouncing of all

<sup>1</sup> σου, which T. R. reads with 12 Mjj., nearly all the Mss. Syr. Cop. is omitted by **NA** B C D L 1<sup>pl</sup> etc. Vulg. ; **S** omits the words σου . . .

αληθεια (confusion of the two αληθεια).  
<sup>2</sup> B reads η (*the*) before αληθεια.

self-gratification, however lawful it may be, the absence of all interested aims, of all self-seeking. This is the sublime idea of Christian *holiness*, but regarded here, where the question is of the apostles, as about to be realized under the special form of the Christian *ministry*, in the same way as each believer is to realize it under the form of the special task which is providentially assigned to him. We have given to *iv*, in the translation, the instrumental sense *by*, as in i. 31, 33. The divine truth is thus designated as the *agent* of the consecration. *Meyer*, *Weiss* and others translate *in*: “*In this sphere* of truth, where I have placed them, complete the work of sanctifying them.” But to what purpose, in this case, the addition of the words: “*Thy word is truth*”? Must they not serve to present *the truth* as the *means* by which alone this consecration can be effected? *Weiss* tries in vain to give another sense.—The T. R. reads *σοῦ* (*of thee*) with the words *the truth* in the first clause; this pronoun is wanting in the Alexandrian authorities, and was probably added from the following clause (*thy word*).—The *truth* is the adequate expression of the character of God and of His relation to us. This truth is found only in the word of God addressed to the world by the mouth of Jesus. The second ἀληθεία does not have the article: This word is truth, nothing but truth.—In support of this prayer, Jesus alleges two reasons, one drawn from what they will have to do for the world (ver. 18), the other from the work which He accomplishes upon Himself on their behalf (ver. 19). Their mission is His, and His holiness will be theirs.

Vv. 18, 19. “*According as thou hast sent me into the world, I also have sent them into the world. 19. And for their sakes I<sup>1</sup> sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified in truth.*”—If Jesus asks for them the spirit of their charge (ver. 17), it is because He has confided to them *the charge* itself. The term ἀπέστειλα, *I have sent*, alludes to the title of *apostles* which He has given them. But how does Jesus say that He has sent them into the world, when they are already in it? It is because He has drawn them to Himself and raised them into a higher sphere than the life of the world (ver. 16), and it is from thence that He now sends them to the world, as really as He was Himself sent from heaven. And the mission which He gives them is only the continuation of that which the Father has given Him (καθώς, *according as*); herein is the first reason which He presses in support of His petition: *Sanctify them*.

The second is set forth in ver. 19. The force of *καί*, *and*, at the beginning of this verse, is this: “*And to obtain for them this consecration which I ask for, I begin by consummating my own.*” Jesus asks nothing of the Father except after having done, or when doing Himself what depends on Himself to the end of making possible the realization of His prayer; comp. vv. 4, 6, 8, 12, 14. It is on what He does for His own sanctification that theirs will be founded. The words *ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν*, *for them*, are at the beginning because they set forth the aim of His work with reference to Himself. The word *sanctify* does not by any means imply, as we have seen, the removal

<sup>1</sup> Ἔ A omit εγω.

of defilement ; for it is not synonymous with *purify* (*καθαρίζειν*) ; it is therefore a wrong course in some interpreters to find in this word a proof of the existence of sin in Jesus. The majority of interpreters (*Chrysostom*, *Meyer*, *Reuss*, *Weiss*, etc.) apply this word to the consecration which Jesus makes of His person at this moment in view of His expiatory death. *Weiss* sustains this meaning by the ordinary use of the word *hiquedisch* in the Old Testament to designate the idea of sacrificing. But this last reason proves nothing ; for this term, as well as the Greek word, designates all consecration, even that which does not issue in death ; comp. *Matt.* xxiii. 17, which we have just cited. And this sense is not admissible here, because it is inapplicable in the following clause, unless we see, with *Chrysostom*, in the sanctification of the apostles their acceptance of martyrdom, or refer it, as *Meyer* and *Reuss* do, to the gift of the Holy Spirit as the result of the expiatory death, or give up, as *Weiss* does, assigning the same meaning to the verb *ἀγαζεν* in the two clauses, and find therein a special nicety of expression ; all which interpretations are quite improbable, the first, because the greater part of the apostles do not seem to have been martyrs ; the second, because the relation between the two acts of consecration would be much too indirect ; the third, because the *ἴνα*, *that*, as well as the *καί*, *them also*, implies two consecrations of a homogeneous character. We must, therefore, with *Calvin*, abide by the natural meaning of *ἀγαζεν* : to take a thing away from a profane use in order to consecrate it to the service of God. Jesus possessed a human nature, such as ours, endowed with inclinations and repugnances like ours, but yet perfectly lawful. Of this nature He continually made a holy offering ; negatively, by sacrificing it where it was in contradiction to His mission (the culture of the arts and sciences, for example, or the family life) ; positively, in consecrating to the task assigned Him of God all His powers, all His natural and spiritual talents. It is thus “*that He offered Himself to God without spot, through the eternal Spirit*” (*Heb.* ix. 14). When the question was of sacrificing a gratification, as in the desert, or of submitting to a sorrow, as in Gethsemane, He incessantly subjected His nature to the work to which the will of the Father called Him. And this was not effected once for all. His human life received the seal of consecration increasingly even till the entire and final sacrifice of death, when “*by the things which He suffered*” He finished the “*learning obedience*” (*Heb.* v. 8).—The pronouns *I* and *myself* set forth the energetic action which Jesus was obliged to exercise upon Himself in order to attain this result.—Thereby Jesus realized in His own person the perfect consecration of the *human life*, and He thus laid the foundations of the consecration of this life in all His followers. This is what is expressed by the following clause : *That they also may be sanctified*, which develops the meaning of the first words : *for them*. According to *Weiss*, Jesus speaks here of a purely negative fact : the removal through the expiatory sacrifice of Christ of the guilt resulting from the defilements contracted by the believer, a guilt which would prevent his consecration to God. This is to fail to recognize the difference in meaning between the two terms *sanctify* and *purify*, and arbitrarily to change the meaning which the word *sanctify* had in the pre-

ceding clause. The meaning is indeed as follows : The sanctification of every believer is nothing else than the communication which Jesus makes to him of His own sanctified person. This is what He had already intimated in vi. 53-57 and 63, and what St. Paul develops in Rom. viii. 1-3, where he shows that Christ began by *condemning* sin in the flesh (condemned to non-existence), in order that the (moral) righteousness, required by the law, might be realized in us. Jesus created a holy humanity in His person, and the Spirit has the task and the power to reproduce in us this new humanity : “ *The law of the Spirit of life which is in Jesus Christ has made me free from the law of sin and death.*” In this point, as in all others, the part of the Spirit consists in taking *what belongs to Jesus* (this perfectly holy human life), to give it to us. If this holy life had not been realized in Christ, the Spirit would have nothing to communicate to us in this regard, and the sanctification of humanity would have remained a barren aspiration. It is difficult to understand how *Weiss* can say that, with this interpretation, everything is reduced to the imitation of the example of Christ.—Let us remark finally that by reason of ver. 17, the question here is of the apostles, not only as Christians, but especially as *ministers* (ver. 18). Jesus Himself, while sanctifying Himself as *man* and for the purpose of realizing in Himself the ideal of human holiness, sanctified Himself at the same time as *Saviour* and for the purpose of giving life to mankind. In the same way, the task of the apostles will not only be to realize the consecration in that general form under which all believers are called to it ; by freeing them from every earthly vocation and sending them into the world as His ambassadors, Jesus desired that their personal sanctification might be effected under the particular form of the apostleship. This form is not more holy, but it has, more than any earthly vocation, the character of a special consecration to the work of God. Ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, *in truth*, must have here, because of the want of the article, the adverbial sense : *in a true way*, in opposition both to the false Pharisaic consecration and to the ritual consecration of the Levitical priesthood. Thus from the general petition : *I pray for them*, there have been evolved these two clearly progressive petitions : “ *Keep them in holiness ! Consecrate them by an increasing holiness, to the end that they may become, after me and like me, the agents of the sanctification of the world.*” It is natural that Jesus should pass from this to a prayer on behalf of the world itself, at least as to the future believing portion of it, vv. 20-26. Jesus prays for *the believers* and asks for them two things : vv. 20, 21, spiritual unity ; vv. 22-24, participation in His glory ; finally, He justifies these petitions in vv. 25, 26.

Vv. 20-26. Jesus prays for the union of believers with Himself and among themselves.

Vv. 20, 21. “ *And it is not for these only that I pray, but for all those who believe on me through their word, 21, that they all may be one ; that, as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, they also may be<sup>2</sup> in us, that the world may*

<sup>1</sup> T. R. with D<sup>2</sup> some Mss. *ἠπιστευόντων* Vulg. (*who believe*).

Sah. : *πιστευουστων* (*who shall believe*). The 19<sup>th</sup> <sup>2</sup> *Ev* before *ωσιν* is rejected by B C D It<sup>114</sup> Mj. all the other Mss. Syr. Cop. : *πιστευουστων* Sah.

believe<sup>1</sup> that thou hast sent me.”—Jesus has commended to God the *author* and the *instruments* of the work of salvation; He now prays on behalf of the *object* of this work, the body of believers. The Church appears here elevated by faith into unity with God, and rendered capable thereby of beholding and sharing the glory of the Son. It is the realization of the supreme destiny of humanity which He contemplates and asks for, the contents of that “*hidden wisdom which God had foreordained before the ages for our glory*” (1 Cor. ii. 7). The question therefore is not only, as is often supposed, of the union of Christians among themselves, but above all of the union which is the basis of this, that of the body of believers with Christ and, through Him, with God Himself. This sublime unity it is which Jesus, in what follows, contrasts with that of the world. The true reading is certainly the present participle πιστευόντων, *the believers*, and not, as the T. R. reads, almost without any authorities, the future πιστευσόντων, *those who shall believe*. These believers are undoubtedly not the believers at the moment when Jesus is praying, since they had believed through His word and not through that of the apostles. But He pictures to Himself all believers, speaking absolutely. He sees them in spirit, these believers of all times and places, and by His prayer He unites them in one body and transports them, in some sense, to glory. This present cannot be rendered, in French, in an altogether exact way. In *Reuss's* view, this present participle proves that it is the evangelist and not Jesus who is speaking. This is to ascribe great unskilfulness to so able a composer.—The last words assign to the apostolic teaching a capital part in the life of the Church. Jesus recognizes, in the future, no faith capable of uniting man to God and preparing him for glory except that which is produced and nourished by the word of the Eleven. The term *word* (λόγος) does not, as the term *testimony* (μαρτυρία) might do, designate merely the narration of the evangelical facts; it contains also the revelation of the religious and moral meaning of the facts. It is the contents of the Epistles, as well as that of the Gospels. Men cannot really come to faith in Christ (εἰς ἐμέ, *on me*), at any time, except through this intermediate agency. How can *Reuss* infer from this passage that the apostles have no other privilege relatively to other believers but that of *priority*? This saying assigns to them a unique place in the life of the Church. No teaching capable of producing faith can be other than a reproduction of theirs.—The following verses present the object of the petition under the form of an *end* to be attained by this very prayer (*va, in order that*); ver. 21 designates this end in itself; ver. 22 states what Jesus has done already to the end of the possibility of its realization; ver. 23 shows it perfectly attained.—It seems to me that the first clause of ver. 21 is formed only of the words: *that all may be one*, which indicate the general idea; then, that the clause: *as thou, Father, . . .* depends on the following *that*, by an inversion similar to that of xiii. 34. There is, therefore, here an explanatory resumption: “That they may be one; that, *I say*, as thou, Father, . . . they also may be in us.” This construction does not

<sup>1</sup> N B C : πιστευη, instead of πιστευση.

have the dragging character of that which makes the *as* depend on the first *that*. After having asked for the general unity of believers (*all*), Jesus describes it as a unity of the most elevated order; it partakes of the *nature* (*καθώς*) of that of the Father and the Son. As the Father lives in the Son and the Son in the Father, so the Son lives in the believers and, by living in them, He unites them closely one with another. Instead of: "that they may be *one* in us," some Mj. read: "that they may be in us." It may be said that the context requires the idea of the *unity* of believers, and that the small word *ev* was easily lost in the *ev* *hūm* which precedes. The idea, however, does not imperatively require this word. It is by being *in* Christ and through Him *in* God (*in us*), that believers find themselves living in each other. That which separates them is what they have of self in their views and will; that which unites them is what they have of Christ, and thereby of the divine, in them. It is clear that this dwelling of Christ and consequently of God in them is the work of the Spirit, who alone has the power to cast down the barrier between personalities, without confounding them.—Such an organism, exercising its functions on the earth, is a manifestation so new that the sight of it must be a powerful means of bringing the world to *faith* in Him from whom it proceeds. Here is the content of the third *that*, which is subordinate to the two preceding ones, and indicates the final purpose of them. The word *believe* is never taken in the New Testament otherwise than in a favorable sense (except in James ii. 19, which relates to an altogether peculiar case). It cannot therefore designate a forced conviction, such as that which may be found in Phil. ii. 10 f. No doubt, Jesus does not mean to say that the whole world will believe; this would be contradictory to what He said of the world in xv. 20, 22, 24. We must recall to mind the fact that the question is of an *end* which cannot be accomplished for all. In any case, Jesus declares that in the world estranged from God there are yet elements capable of being gained for faith. And what the sight of a local and passing phenomenon, like that of the primitive Church in Jerusalem, produced among the Jewish people (Acts ii. 44–47),—will not the same spectacle, when magnified, produce this also on a grander scale, one day, throughout the entire world? Perhaps even Jesus is thinking more especially of the conversion of the Jews at the end of time, when they shall see the Church realized in all its beauty among the Gentiles. In xv. 18, 20, the word *world* designates, above all, the Jewish people. This supposition is confirmed by the words: *that it is thou who hast sent me*, that is to say: "that I, this Jesus of Nazareth, whom they have rejected, am really the promised Sent one whom they were expecting." Rom. xi. 25, 31. Comp. 1 John i. 3; Eph. iv. 13.—After having presented to God this end worthy of His love, Jesus recalls in ver. 22, as in vv. 4, 6, 14, 18, how He has Himself prepared the work of which He asks the completion, and in ver. 23 He describes its glorious consummation.

Vv. 22, 23. "And the glory which thou hast given me, I have given them, that they may be one, as we are one,<sup>1</sup> 23, I in them and thou in me; that their

<sup>1</sup> B C D L reject *εσμεν*, and *Ν εν εσμεν*.

unity may be perfect, that<sup>1</sup> the world may know that thou hast sent me and that thou hast loved<sup>2</sup> them as thou hast loved me.”—In this whole prayer, Jesus rests His petitions on the fact that He has already begun that of which He asks the completion. Hence the *ἐγώ*, I, placed at the beginning.—What is the glory of which Jesus has already made a gift to His own, and by means of which He has laid the foundation of the unity which He asks for? *Chrysostom* and, at the present day, *Weiss* understand by it the glorious power of sustaining their apostolic ministry by miracles. But this outward sign has nothing in common with the inward sphere in which the thought of Jesus is here moving. How could a result like this, which is expressed by the following *ὡς*, that, proceed from a miraculous power, an external, passing and individual phenomenon? *Hengstenberg* refers this term *glory* to the participation of believers in the unity of the Father and the Son; but this explanation leads to a tautology with the following clause. *De Wette*, *Reuss*, *Meyer*, apply this term *glory* to the kingdom which is to come, and the word *give* to a property only *by right*; but this is to anticipate the meaning of ver. 24. Jesus starts, on the contrary, in ver. 22 from a fact already accomplished, in order to make it the point of departure for a coming good (ver. 23) which will precede the final glory (ver. 24). We read, ver. 24, that the glory of Jesus consists in being the eternal object of the Father's love; the glory which He has communicated to believers is, therefore, the becoming by faith what He is essentially, the objects of this same divine love; comp. ver. 23 (*that thou hast loved them as thou hast loved me*) and ver. 26. This glory, which is that of adoption, Jesus has communicated to His own by bringing things to this point,—that God can, without obscuring His holiness, convey to them the love which He has for Jesus Himself. By this means we understand the following clause: *that they may be one, as we [are] one*. This love of the Father, of which they are all the objects in common, unites them closely among themselves and makes them all one family of which Jesus is the elder Brother (Rom. viii. 29, Eph. i. 10).

The first words of ver. 23, in a clause which is simply placed in juxtaposition with the preceding: “that they may be one as we are,” remind us of the *mode* of this unity: God living in Christ, Christ living in each believer, and this to the end that the limit of a perfect unity may be attained, and that the organism of humanity consummated in God may appear.—The aim of this admirable unity is that the world *may know*. This word is undoubtedly not the synonym of *believe*, ver. 21. The term *know* includes with the *faith* of believers (ver. 21) the forced *conviction* of rebels. For how could the word *κόσμος*, *the world*, designate only the believers? The question is of the universal homage, voluntary or involuntary, rendered to Christ—such as is described in Phil. ii. 10, Rom. xiv. 10–12. The whole universe renders homage to the divine messenger who, by transforming believers into His own image, has succeeded in making them loved as He is Himself loved.—Thus is the way prepared for the pointing out of the final

<sup>1</sup> N B C D L X It<sup>si</sup> Cop. Orig. reject καὶ <sup>2</sup> D 7 Mnn. It<sup>si</sup> Cop.: ἡγάπησα (*that I have loved them*), instead of ἡγάπησας.

end of the ways of God towards the Church of Christ, its participation in the *glory* of the Son of God :

Ver. 24. "*Father, my will is that those whom thou hast given me<sup>1</sup> be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory which thou hast given me, for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world.*"—Perfect unity is the last step before the goal of perfect glory. The repetition of the invocation *Father*, vv. 24, 25, indicates the increasing urgency with which Jesus prays, as He draws nearer the end. The reading  $\delta$   $\delta\epsilon\delta\omega\kappa\alpha\varsigma$ , "*that which thou hast given me,*" is probably the true one ; it brings out the unity of the believers, that perfect  $\epsilon\nu$  which the body of the elect will form (ver. 23). — $\Theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$  : Jesus no longer says, *I pray*, but *I will!* This expression is found nowhere else on His lips ; it is ordinarily explained by saying that the Son expresses Himself thus, because He feels Himself fully in accord on this point with the Father. But was not this the case in general in all His prayers ! This unique expression must be in harmony with the unique character of the situation. And the unique point in this latter is that it is a question of Jesus as dying. It is His testament which Jesus here places in the hands of His Father, and, as the expression is, His *last will*.—All that which Jesus has just asked for them had for its aim to render them fit for the immediate beholding of His glory, from the very moment of their death (xiv. 3). There is no question here of the Parousia, as *Weiss* thinks. The sphere of this divine manifestation is at once inward and heavenly.—*Meyer* thinks that the glory, of which Jesus says that the Father *has given* it to Him, cannot be His divine glory before the incarnation, and must designate His glory after His exaltation, and He sees in the following words : *for thou lovedst me before, . . . the ground on which God thus glorifies Jesus.* But the ground of the exaltation of Jesus is quite differently described, not only by Paul (Phil. ii. 9–11), but also by John himself, x. 17, xiii. 32, xv. 10 : it is His perfect obedience even to death and even to the death of the cross. The  $\delta\tau\iota$  therefore means : *in that*, and serves to explain *wherein* this glory of the Son *consists* : it is in having been the eternal object of the Father's love. Is there any glory to be compared with this ? The word *given* may be incompatible with a certain conception of the divine Trinity ; it is not so with that of John, which includes as a necessary element the relation of subordination between the Son and the Father ; comp. i. 1 (*with God*) ; i. 18 (*in the bosom of the Father*) ; v. 26 ("it has been *given* him to have life in himself"), etc. The words : *before the foundation of the world*, imply eternity, for the world includes all that which has come into existence. This saying of Jesus is that which leads us farthest into the divine depths. It shows Christian speculation on what path it must seek the solution of the relations of the Trinity ; love is the key of this mystery. And as this love is eternal, and consequently has no more an end than it has had a beginning, it may one day become for believers the permanent object of an immediate contemplation, through which they will find themselves initiated into the mystery of the essence of the

<sup>1</sup> Instead of  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma$  (*those whom*),  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  B D Cop.  $\circ$  (*that which*).

Son and of His eternal generation. Far more ; as, by the complete community which the Son has succeeded in establishing between them and Him, they are the objects of a similar love to that of which the Son is the object, they will find themselves thus introduced into the eternal movement of the divine life itself. This appears from the word *behold*. One does not behold a fact of this order without being in some manner associated with it. Here is the height to which Jesus elevates the Church. After having drawn His spouse from the midst of a world sunk in evil, He introduces her into the sphere of the divine life.

Vv. 25, 26 have as their aim to justify this last will of Jesus, not only from the standpoint of grace, but even from that of *righteousness*, precisely that one of the divine perfections which might seem opposed to the petition of Jesus in behalf of His own.

Vv. 25, 26. "*Righteous Father, the world, it is true, has not known thee ; but as for me, I have known thee ; and these have known that thou hast sent me. 26. And I have made known to them thy name, and will make it known, that the love wherewith thou hast loved me<sup>1</sup> may be in them, and that I may be in them.*" —Jesus does not say, as He did in ver. 11 : "*Holy Father.*" And He certainly has His reasons for substituting here for the title *holy* the title *righteous*. What follows does not permit us to doubt that He takes this word in the sense of *justice* strictly so-called, retributive justice. *Hengstenberg, Meyer, Weiss, Keil, Westcott, etc.*, have clearly seen this. In fact, Jesus opposes to the world, which has refused to know God and has thus rendered itself unworthy to be admitted to the contemplation of His glory, His own (*οἱ*, *these*), who have consented to know God and have thus become worthy of the privilege which He asks for them (ver. 24). Hence, as it appears to me, it follows that in the first words of ver. 25 the *καί* before *οἱ* and the *καί* before *ὁ κόσμος* are two *καί* of contrast, such as we have seen so many times in John (i. 10, vi. 36, xv. 24), serving to bring together, by reason of their very opposition, the two contrary facts. But what has prevented interpreters from apprehending this relation is the fact that John intercalates between the two terms of the principal contrast a third term intended to introduce the second : "But as for *me*, I have known thee." If the believers have arrived at the knowledge of God, it is not of themselves, but only by means of the knowledge which their Master had of God and which He has communicated to them. The *δέ*, *but*, indicates a first antithesis with reference to the *καί*, which precedes, relatively to the world,—a fact which makes the second *καί*, before *οἱ*, appear no longer other than the completing of the antithesis expressed by this *δέ* which accompanies the *ἐγώ*. We may compare xvi. 20, as an example of an antithesis in some sort broken by a secondary antithesis intercalated between the two members of the principal contrast. This explanation draws near to that of *Bäumlein*, and is in the main accepted by *Keil*. *Meyer* also explains the first *καί* as indicating an opposition, but an opposition to the idea of righteousness expressed in the invocation *Righteous Father!* "*And yet* (although thou

<sup>1</sup> *Σ* reads *αυτους* (*them*) instead of *με*.

art righteous) the world has not known thee as such." This non-recognition is, according to this view, that of which Paul speaks in Rom. i. 19, which consisted in the blindness of men with reference to the revelation of God in the works of nature. But this idea has not the least connection with the context. Jesus has Himself said (in xv. 22, 24) that all the sins previous to His coming would not have been imputed to the world, if it had not put the crowning point upon them by the rejection of Him. The terms *to know* and *not to know* God can refer here only to the acceptance or rejection of the revelation of the character of God in the appearance of Jesus.—Weiss sees in the first *καί*, not an opposition to the second, but a particle which connects this verse with that which precedes. But what logical connection is it possible to establish between the admission of believers to the spectacle of the glory of Christ (ver. 24) and the refusal of the world to know God! This, then, is the meaning of this prayer: "The world, it is true, is the just object of Thy rejection by reason of its refusal to know Thee; but these, in receiving me, who have brought to them the knowledge of Thee, are become worthy of the privilege which I now ask of Thee for them."

Ver. 26. No doubt the light which has dawned in the hearts of the disciples through the revelation of God in Christ as yet only begins to appear. But Jesus pledges Himself to communicate to them for the future the fulness of the knowledge of the Father which He Himself possesses.—The future: *I will make known*, does not refer to the death of Jesus, as Weiss supposes, but, according to the preceding chapters (xiv. 21, 26, xvi. 25), to the sending of the Holy Spirit and the entire work of Jesus in the Church after the day of Pentecost. *Reuss* well renders the admirable thought contained in the words: *And that the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them*: "The love of God which, before the creation of the physical world, had its adequate object in the person of the Son (ver. 24), finds it, since the creation of the new spiritual world, in all those who are united with the Son." What God desired in sending His Son here on earth was precisely that He might form for Himself in the midst of humanity a family of children like Him, of which He should be the elder Brother (Rom. viii. 29).—Jesus adds: *And that I myself may be in them*. Connected as it is with the preceding words, this expression must mean: "And in loving them thus, it will still be myself in them whom thou wilt love, and thus thy love will not attach itself to anything that is defiled." Its object, indeed, will be Jesus living in them, His holy image reproduced in their person.

What simplicity, what calmness, what transparent depth in this whole prayer! "It is indeed," as *Gess* says, "the only Son who here speaks to His Father. Everything in these beautiful words is *supernatural*, because He who speaks is the only Son who has come from heaven; but at the same time everything in them is *natural*, for He speaks as a son speaks to his father." The feeling which is the soul of this prayer, the ardent zeal for the glory of God, is that which inspired Jesus throughout His whole life. His three petitions—that for His personal glorification, that for the consecration of His

apostles and that for the glorification of the Church, are indeed the sentiments which must have filled His soul in view of the blow which was about to put an end to His earthly activity. In the details not a word has been met whose appropriateness and fitness to the given situation has not been proved by exegesis. Can it be possible to hold, with *Baur*, that, at the distance of more than a century, a Christian should have succeeded in reproducing thus the impressions of Jesus? This would be to say that there existed then another Jesus than Jesus Himself.

*Weiss* and *Reuss* hold, as we do, that this is the composition of an immediate witness. But they find in certain passages—in ver. 3 for example—the proof that the disciple has reproduced the thoughts of the Master after his own fashion. The second asks whether John had, then, in his hands tablets and pencil to take down word for word the prayer of Jesus.—But, if John truly regarded Jesus as the Logos, we ask once again how could the respect which he must have had for His words have permitted him to make Him speak, and especially pray, according to his own fancy? He undoubtedly did not have his pencil in hand; but the memory is proportionate to the attention and the attention to the interest; now must not that of John have been excited to the highest degree? On the other hand, the words of Jesus, simple, grave, earnest, were of a nature to impress themselves more deeply and distinctly on the heart of John than any other words. Moreover, it is not impossible that, at an inconsiderable remove of time from that evening, John should have felt the need of committing to writing what he recalled to mind of these last conversations and this prayer.. Or again, the unceasingly renewed meditation upon these words engraved upon the tablets of his heart and ever refreshed by the action of the Spirit, may have supplied the place of any external means. This inward miracle, if one will call it so, is far less improbable than the artificial composition of such a prayer.

But is the profound calmness which reigns in this scene compatible with the agony in Gethsemane which immediately follows it in the other Gospels? *Keim* asserts that John by this narrative *annihilates the Synoptical tradition*.—The conflict in Gethsemane has the character of a sudden crisis, of a violent shock, in some sort of an explosion, after which calmness was re-established in the soul of Jesus as quickly as it had been troubled. This passing crisis has a double cause: the one natural, the singular impressibility of the soul of Jesus, of which we have seen so many proofs in our Gospel, particularly in ch. xi. and xii. 27. By virtue of the very purity of His nature, Jesus was accessible, as was no other man, to every lawful emotion. His soul resembled a magnetic needle, whose mobility is only equalled by the perseverance with which, in every oscillation, it tends to recover its normal direction. Gethsemane must have been for Jesus, not punishment, but the struggle with a view to the *acceptance* of punishment; and thus the anticipatory suffering of the cross. Such an anticipation is sometimes more painful than the reality itself. The supernatural cause is pointed out by Jesus Himself, xiv. 30: “*The prince of this world is coming.*” Comp. Luke xxii. 53: “*This is your hour and the power of darkness.*” The extraordinary character of this agony betrays itself in its suddenness and even its violence. St. Luke had closed his narrative of the temptation in the desert with the words: “*The devil withdrew from him, ἀχρηκαίρῳ, until another favorable moment.*” The hour of Gethsemane was that moment which Satan judged favorable to subject Jesus to the new test which

he was reserving for Him. There is nothing here which is not in perfect accord with the normal development of Jesus' life.

The sacerdotal prayer is, as it were, the amen added by Jesus to His work accomplished here on earth ; it forms thus the climax of this part, which is intended to trace out the *development of faith* in the disciples (chs. xiii.-xvi.), and corresponds, notwithstanding the difference of forms, with the passage in xii. 37-50, in which John gave his reflections on the history of Jewish unbelief (chs. v.-xii.).

## FOURTH PART.

### THE PASSION.

XVIII. 1.—XIX. 42.

The intention of the evangelist, in the following narrative, is certainly not to give a narration as complete as possible of the Passion, as if no narrative of this event existed side by side with his own. The most pronounced adversaries of the authenticity of our Gospel, *Baur* and *Strauss*, are at the present day in accord with the orthodox interpreters, *Lange* and *Hengstenberg*, on the point that the narrative of the fourth evangelist stands in constant relation to those of his three predecessors. The difference is only on the question of the end which the author proposes to himself in composing this fourth narrative. According to *Baur* and *Strauss*, the pseudo-John borrows from the Synoptics, the materials which are indispensable to the end of giving some probability to his romance of Jesus-Logos. According to the commentators of the opposite side, John endeavors simply to fill up the vacancies in the earlier narrations, or to present the facts, already previously related, in their true light.

We are convinced that, as the latter writers think, the choice of materials is frequently determined by the intention of completing the accounts already current in the church. Thus, when John relates the examination of Jesus in the house of Annas, which the Synoptics omit, and omits the appearance before the Sanhedrim, which the first Gospels relate with detail, this intention seems evident. It will appear also from a multitude of other examples. But, on the other hand, the narrative of John has presented, up to this point, a too serious meditative character and too profound elaboration to allow the possibility of holding that, in the part which is to follow, it is not governed by any higher thought, and is obedient only to chance, as would be the case in a narrative which confined itself to relating that which others had not related.

In the narrative of the Passion in John, we shall find, as throughout his whole work, the triple point of view indicated in the introduction (Vol. I., p. 228 f.). Jesus causes *His glory* to shine forth through the veil of ignominy by which it was covered, and this especially through the freedom with which He surrenders Himself to the fate which awaits Him; this is here, as always, the luminous foundation of the whole narrative. On this foundation there stands out in relief, as a dark figure, the *Jewish unbelief* unmasking its moral perversity by a series of odious acts and disloyal words, and,

after having thus pronounced its own condemnation, reaching its consummation in the murder of the Messiah. Finally, in contrast with it, we discern *the faith* which is hidden in the person of the disciples gathering up the scattered rays of the glory of Jesus, and growing in silence, as plants during a storm. The second of these three features is that which prevails in the following narrative.

Three principal scenes :

1. The arrest of Jesus : xviii. 1-11.
2. His double trial, ecclesiastical and civil : xviii. 12-xix. 16.
3. His punishment : xix. 17-42.

### FIRST SECTION.

#### XVIII. 1-11.

##### THE ARREST OF JESUS.

John omits here the account of the agony of Jesus in Gethsemane ; but he clearly assigns to this fact its place by these words of ver. 1 : *where there was a garden into which he entered*. In reading these words, no Christian, in possession of the first three Gospels, could fail to think of that narrative. The reason of this omission, as well as of the omission of the accounts of the transfiguration, the institution of the Holy Supper, and so many others, is that John knew that this scene was sufficiently well known in the church, and that it had no special relation to the end which he set before himself. There cannot be a dogmatic design in this omission ; this is proved by the story in xii. 24-27, which belongs exclusively to John, and in which he has preserved for us the moral essence of the scene in Gethsemane.

*Strauss* exclaims : " Every attempt to insert in John's narrative, between chs. xvii. and xviii. the agony of Gethsemane is an attack upon the moral elevation and even the manly character of Jesus."<sup>1</sup> According to this, John would have been the first to commit an outrage of this kind (xii. 27). *Strauss* concludes from this that the Synoptic narrative is " a more naïve poetic fiction " than that of John, which presents to us " a more well-considered and carefully contrived poetic fiction." Thus those who relate, lie in relating ; he who omits, lies in omitting ! This is the point at which criticism arrives by pursuing its course even to the end. It destroys itself.

Vv. 1-3. The arrival of the band. " *After having said these things, Jesus went out with his disciples beyond the brook Cedron,<sup>2</sup> where there was a garden, into which he entered as well as his disciples. 2. Now Judas, who betrayed him, also knew this place, because Jesus had often met<sup>3</sup> there with his disciples. 3. Judas, then, having taken the cohort, with officers sent by the chief priests and Pharisees, comes thither with lanterns, torches and weapons.*"—The verb ἐξῆλθε,

<sup>1</sup> *Das Leben Jesu*, 1864, p. 553.

<sup>2</sup> A S Δ H<sup>1019</sup> Vulg. and some other V<sup>ss</sup>. read τὸν κεδρῶν (of Cedron), Σ D H<sup>1019</sup> Cop. Sah. : τὸν κεδρῶν (of the cedar), T. R. with B C E G H

K L M U X Y Γ Δ Η most of the Mss. Orig. and Tisch. : τῶν κεδρῶν (of the cedars).

<sup>3</sup> 9 Mj. (E G M etc.) read καὶ after συνήχθη.

he went out, is ordinarily referred to the departure from the supper room. See on xiv. 31. In our view, this verb, being directly connected, as it is, with the limiting phrase *πέραν τοῦ χειμάρρου*, *beyond the brook*, designates a time farther removed, and signifies rather: "He went out *from the city* to pass across the brook." This is acknowledged by *de Wette*, even though he holds, with so many others, that the discourses of chs. xiii.–xvii. were pronounced in the supper room.—The received reading, which is that of the *Vatican MS.* and of most of the *Mjj.* and *Mnn.*, and of *Origen*, is τῶν Κέδρων, and would signify "the brook of *the cedars*;" there would be evidently an error of John here, for the name *Cedron* comes from קִדְרוֹן (*Kidron*), *black* (black water). In *Josephus* also the name Κέδρων is a nominative singular (for example, *χειμάρρος Κεδρώνος*, *Antiq.* viii. 1, 5). The reading of the *Sinaitic* and *Cambridge MSS.* is τοῦ Κέδρου, *of the cedar*. It is evident that these two readings are the work of copyists, some of whom conformed the substantive to the article (by substituting Κέδρου for Κέδρων), others the article to the substantive (substituting τῶν for τοῦ), and that the true reading—apparently very improbable—is that of the *Alexandrian MS.* and of the *Sangallensis*, τοῦ Κέδρου, which alone easily explains the two others. *Westcott*, in honor of the *Vatican*, maintains the reading τῶν Κέδρων, by appealing to a legend of the *Jerusalem Talmud*, according to which there were some cedars on the Mount of Olives; *Tischendorf*, out of regard for the *Sinaitic MS.*, reads τοῦ Κέδρου. Behold what prepossession can effect! The same variety of readings is found again in several MSS. of the Old Testament (LXX); see 2 Sam. xv. 23 and 1 Kings xv. 13.—The brook *Cedron* has its source half a league to the north of *Jerusalem*, and falls into the *Dead Sea* at the southward after a course of six or seven leagues. It is ordinarily dry during nine months of the year; for more than twenty years, as we were told in *Jerusalem*, not a sign of water had been seen in it. Its bed is at the bottom of the valley of *Jehoshaphat*, between the temple hill and the Mount of Olives. After having passed the little bridge by which this dried-up bed is crossed, one finds on the right a plot of ground planted with ancient olive trees, which is asserted to be the garden of *Gethsemane*. There is no valid reason, whatever *Keim* may say, against the truth of this tradition. The word *πολλάκις*, *often*, in ver. 2, might apply only to the preceding days; but it is more probable that it refers also to the earlier sojourns of *Jesus* in *Jerusalem*. This garden undoubtedly belonged to friends of *Jesus*. It ordinarily served as a place of meeting for the Lord and His disciples (συνήχθη, the aorist: *he met with*), when they returned from *Jerusalem* to the Mount of Olives and to *Bethany*, and wished to avoid passing all together through the streets of the city. Comp. *Luke* xxi. 37, xxii. 39.—The term *σπείρα* always designates, in the *New Testament* (*Matt.* xxvii. 27, *Acts* xxi. 31), and in *Josephus*, the Roman legion or a part of the legion which occupied the citadel of *Antonia*, at the north-eastern angle of the temple. A detachment of Roman soldiers had seemed necessary to support the servants of the *Sanhedrim*. For *Mark* xiv. 2 proves that a rising in favor of *Jesus* was feared; and for this reason it had been necessary to ask for orders from the governor. This detachment was commanded by the

tribune himself, the *chiliarch*, mentioned in ver. 12. The article *ἡ*, "the cohort," designates the well-known cohort; and, if it seems to indicate the presence of this entire body of soldiers (600 men), we must find here either a popular expression or a manner of speaking which is justified by the presence of the commander-in-chief. The Synoptics do not speak of this escort. The message of Pilate's wife, however, which is related by Matthew, proves that, since the preceding evening, the governor had been occupied with this matter; and this circumstance confirms the fact of the participation of the Roman soldiery in the arrest. *Κοίμ* turns this narrative into ridicule, by speaking ironically of "half an army;" this wretched piece of pleasantry is quite gratuitous. *Βάμλειν* and others have contended against the application of the term *σπείρα* to the Roman garrison, and have thought that the question was only of the guard of the temple. But the constant meaning of this word does not allow this explanation.—The *ὑπηρέται*, *officers*, are, as in vii. 32, 45, the sergeants of the temple. They were the persons who had properly the task of arresting Jesus. The Roman cohort was only to give them aid in case of resistance. Ver. 10 shows that servants belonging to the houses of the chief priests had also joined the band.—The meaning of the words *φανοί* and *λαμπάδες* is questionable. The first seems to us rather to designate lanterns; the second, resin torches. All this apparatus: "Lanterns and torches and weapons" (the two *καί*, *and*, are to be noticed), by its very uselessness casts a kind of ridicule upon this scene. It is feared that Jesus may hide Himself, and yet He surrenders Himself voluntarily (ver. 4), or that He may defend Himself; . . . but what purpose would these weapons have served, if He had wished to make use of His power (ver. 6) ?

Vv. 4-9. The meeting of Jesus with the band. "*Jesus therefore, knowing all that which was to come upon him, went forth and says to them:*<sup>1</sup> *Whom are you seeking for?* 5. *They answered him, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus says to them, I am he. Now Judas, who betrayed him, was also standing among them.* 6. *When therefore Jesus said to them, I am he, they went backward and fell to the ground.* 7. *Jesus asked them a second time, Whom are you seeking for? They said, Jesus of Nazareth.* 8. *Jesus answered, I have told you that I am he; if therefore you are seeking me, let these go their way;* 9, *that the word might be fulfilled which he had spoken: I have lost none of those whom thou hast given me.*"—In coming forward spontaneously and as the first to meet the band, Jesus has a purpose which the sequel will explain. He desires, by giving Himself up, to provide for the safety of His disciples. The word *He went forth* might mean: from the remote part of the garden or from the midst of His disciples; but it is more natural to understand: from the garden itself. He comes forward boldly even before the gate, while His disciples remain grouped behind Him in the garden; thus are the words of ver. 26 easily explained.—The kiss of Judas, in the Synoptics, which is said to be incompatible with John's account, is naturally placed at the moment

<sup>1</sup> **Σ Δ Λ Χ** *Itierique* Syr. *Ἐ* op. : *δε* instead of *οὐν*.

instead of *ἔξελθων εἶπεν* (*having gone forth, he said*).

<sup>2</sup> **Β' C' D** *Itierique* Vulg. : *ἔηλθεν καὶ λέγει*,

when Jesus, coming forth from the garden, meets the band, and thus immediately before the question : *Whom are you seeking?* John alone does not mention this incident, and yet he is accused of personal animosity against Judas !—Jesus, after having experienced this last perfidy from His disciple, turns towards the band, addressing to them the question relative to their commission : He desires to have this distinctly stated, in order to shelter those who are not the object of it—that is, His disciples. The insertion of the remark relating to Judas, at the end of ver. 5, has been explained in different ways. *Luthardt* rightly says : “These words are placed between the declaration *I am he* and the effect produced by it, because they are designed to explain this effect.” The impression of fear produced on the witnesses by the words *I am he*, which were pronounced with majesty and seemed to fall as a threatening from heaven—this impression could have been felt by no one of those present so vividly as by the faithless disciple, who had so often heard this same word as the affirmation of the unique dignity of Jesus ; and it was no doubt from him that the emotion was communicated to those who surrounded and followed him.—The same moral ascendancy to which the traders and money-changers in the temple had yielded, and which had many times arrested the multitude at the moment of stoning Him (comp. also Luke iv. 30), causes the band suddenly to fall back, and this unexpected movement on the part of those who were foremost occasions the falling down of a certain number of those who are following them. There is no direct act of God’s omnipotence here overthrowing these persons, but it would be quite as much an error to see herein only an accidental effect. This result was desired on the part of Him who produced it. By thus making them feel His power, Jesus meant to show them that it would be dangerous for them to go beyond their commission, and thereby to secure the retreat of His disciples. We see how mistaken *Weiss* is in seeing in such a miracle only a miracle of display.—Then, in a milder tone, which leads the officers to approach Him again, Jesus interrogates them a second time ; and after He has again caused them distinctly to declare that it is He, and He alone, whom they have the commission to arrest, He surrenders Himself while stipulating for the liberty of all His disciples. Then it was that the beautiful image was fulfilled which Jesus had used, x. 12 : The shepherd sees the wolf coming, and he does not flee, because he cares for the sheep. The question was not only of the preservation, but even of the *salvation* of the disciples. John felt this indeed, and this is what gives the explanation of the remark in ver. 9. The example of Peter, the most courageous one among them, shows that an arrest would have been, at that moment, for some of the apostles the signal for a deep fall, perhaps for an irreparable denial. And Jesus, who had said to the Father : “*I have watched over those whom thou hast given me, and none of them is lost*” (xvii. 12), must fulfil to the end this serious task. All this causes *Reuss* to smile compassionately. He sees in the application which the author here makes of these words only a proof of his disposition to “indulge in double sense ;” he even asks whether Jesus, in rendering an account to God of the care which He had had of His disciples, “would have hinted that He

took care not to let them spend the following night in the guard-house." For our own part, this quotation seems to us instructive. No one can suppose that John was ignorant of the spiritual sense of the words of Jesus in xvii. 12 : "I have kept those whom thou hast given me, and no one of them is lost ;" and yet he applies it here to a material fact, which undoubtedly pertained, though only indirectly, to the salvation of the disciples. Here is an example fitted to make us see the broad way in which we should treat the Scriptural quotations in general.

Vv. 10, 11. Peter's attempt at defence. "*Then Simon Peter, having a sword, drew it and struck the high-priest's servant and cut off his right ear.*<sup>1</sup> *The servant was named Malchus.* 11. *Jesus therefore said to Peter, Put up the sword<sup>2</sup> into the sheath ; shall I not drink the cup which my Father has given me to drink ?*"—Does not John allude to Peter's natural character by designating him by his name Simon ? Comp. xxi. 15–17.—Luke xxii. 38 proves that the apostles had, in fact, brought arms with them.—This fact had been already related by the Synoptics ; why does John mention it ? He wishes, no doubt, to restore to it the precision which it had lost in the oral narration : the name of Peter had been omitted, and, very probably, intentionally ; that of Malchus had been forgotten.

The intention of depreciating Peter is again imputed to the author ; but wherein ? His action is certainly wanting neither in courage nor in faith nor in love.—And Malchus ? How can there be discovered in this name the least trace of a speculative, ideal or religious intention ? Nevertheless, *Keim* asks : "If these names were known, how should Mark and Luke omit them ?" As if what Luke and Mark were ignorant of might not have been known by another who was better informed ! How can any one persuade himself that a serious Christian of the second century, writing at a distance from Palestine, at Alexandria, in Asia Minor, or at Rome, would have set up the claim of knowing the name of a servant of the high-priest's house, and, besides, the part played by a relative of this servant (ver. 26) ! Is such pitiable charlatanism compatible with the character of the author of the Fourth Gospel ? The trifling detail : "the *right ear*," is also found in Luke (xxii. 50) : this is, according to *Strauss*, a legendary amplification. To what a degree of puerility is not the evangelical narrative thus brought down !—The act of Peter, while testifying of a powerful faith and of the sincerity of his declaration in xiii. 37, was nevertheless compromising to his Master's cause. Peter, by this act, had almost taken away from Jesus the right of saying to Pilate (ver. 36) : "*If my kingdom were of this world, my servants would have fought for me.*" The reply of Jesus has traced for the Church its line of conduct in times of persecution. It is that of passive resistance, which the Apocalypse calls (xiii. 10) "*the patience of the saints.*"—The image of the cup to designate the lot to be submitted to recalls the similar expression in Jesus' prayer in Gethsemane, in the Synoptics.—Luke alone mentions the miraculous healing of Malchus. This fact explains why Peter was not indicted for the crime of rebellion.

<sup>1</sup> B C L X It. Vulg. : ωταριον instead of ωτιον.

<sup>2</sup> Σου which T. R. reads is found only in some Mss. Vulgatiereque.

## SECOND SECTION.

XVIII. 12—XIX. 16.

## THE TRIAL OF JESUS.

1. The ecclesiastical trial: xviii. 12—27; 2. The civil trial: xviii. 28—xix. 16.

I. *The Trial before the Sanhedrim*: xviii. 12—27.

The following section contains the account of an appearance of Jesus in the house of Annas, the ex-high-priest, an account with which that of the denial of St. Peter is, as it were, interlaced. But this appearance is not mentioned in the Synoptics. On the other hand, they relate how Jesus was led from Gethsemane to the house of Caiaphas, where He appeared before the Sanhedrim and was condemned to death; and this solemn and decisive meeting is not mentioned by John.

Some think that there was in reality but one meeting, that of which the Synoptics give an account and which they place in the house of Caiaphas; whether, as *Baur*, *Scholten*, *Keim*, etc., they declare that the meeting in the house of Annas, related in our Gospel, is only an invention of its author, or, as some ancient writers, *Calvin*, *Lücke*, *de Wette*, *Tholuck*, *Langen*,<sup>1</sup> *Luttheroth*,<sup>2</sup> they think that there was only a momentary stay in the house of Annas, after which they went immediately (in ver. 15) to the house of Caiaphas, in which the appearance took place which is related by John vv. 19—23, an appearance which, in any case, must be regarded as identical with the scene of Jesus' condemnation in the Synoptics. Neither the one nor the other of these opinions is admissible. In what interest would the author of the Fourth Gospel have invented this appearance in the house of Annas? It is answered: In order to present the Jews in a more odious light by making Jesus to be condemned by two of their high-priests in succession. But by relating the story in this way, the pseudo-John would not even make Jesus to be condemned by *one* high-priest, since the session in the house of Annas is a simple inquiry without a judgment, and the session of the Synoptics, where the judgment was really pronounced, is omitted! The second opinion comes into collision with ver. 24, which proves that it was only after the inquiry in the house of Annas that Jesus was sent to the house of Caiaphas (see on that verse). If the locality of the two scenes is different, their contents are none the less so; the first is a mere preliminary investigation, the second a judicial act in all due forms, the official pronouncing of the judgment. Besides, what purpose would this stay at the house of Annas have served, and why should John have mentioned it so expressly if nothing occurred there? *Luttheroth* supposes that it was regarded as suitable to inform Annas, in passing, of the success of the arrest. But would it have

<sup>1</sup> *Die letzten Lebenstage Jesu*, 1864.

de l'évangile de saint Matthieu, 1876.

<sup>2</sup> *Essai d'interprétation des dernières parties*

been worth while to mention such a detail?—As it was not possible to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion, either by denying the examination in the house of Annas or by confounding it with the session in the house of Caiaphas, *Beyschlag* has tried the opposite method; he thinks that the meeting in the house of Annas took place as John relates it, but that after this there was no other during the night, like that which is related by Matthew and Mark; that the latter is nothing else than that which, according to Luke, took place on the following morning (xxii. 66–71); the first two Synoptics placed it in the course of the night, because they confounded it with the examination in the house of Annas, of which they do not speak. The reason alleged for this hypothesis is that, if the judgment had been given during the night, there would have been no need of a session on the following morning, such as that of which Luke gives an account. We shall discover the error of *Beyschlag* as to this last point. But what renders this view more suspicious is the gross error which is thus imputed to Mark and Matthew.

It does not seem to us that any question is to be raised as to the fact of two perfectly distinct night sessions, one of which took place in the house of Annas (John) and the other in that of Caiaphas (Matthew and Mark); this is acknowledged by most at the present day—*Neander, Meyer, Weiss, Luthardt, Keil, Reuss*, etc. The Synoptics omitted the first, either because they were ignorant of it, or because it did not occasion any important result. John, on his part, was not ignorant of the second, for he clearly alludes to it in the *first* of ver. 13, which implies as *secondly* the appearance before Caiaphas (see on this word); then, in ver. 24, which expressly mentions as a *subsequent* fact the sending of Jesus to Caiaphas by Annas himself; finally, in ver. 28, where Jesus is led to Pilate, not from Annas' house, but from *that of Caiaphas*. Thus John, if he does not give an account of the session in the house of Caiaphas, very exactly indicates its place, as he had done in ver. 1 with reference to the scene of Gethsemane. Moreover, what completes the proof that John cannot either have been ignorant of or have denied the judgment-scene in the house of Caiaphas, is the whole of the sequel in his own narrative. He represents to us the Sanhedrim as going to ask of Pilate the confirmation and execution of the *death-sentence* which they had pronounced (ver. 31, xix. 7, 11, 16). Now in the session in Annas' house, of which John has given the description, no condemnation was pronounced. John's narrative itself therefore implies a meeting of the Sanhedrim in the proper sense of the word, exercising its functions as a high-court of justice for the judgment of the accused, and consequently the entire meeting in the house of Caiaphas as Matthew and Mark describe it. It will be asked what, in this case, was the purpose of the appearance in the house of Annas. It was, above all, to serve the purpose of drawing from the mouth of Jesus some compromising expression suited to furnish a reason for His condemnation; for there was embarrassment on this subject, as the summoning of the false witnesses in the Synoptics proves. Besides, the judicial customs required this formality. A capital sentence could be pronounced by the Sanhedrim only on the day which followed that on

which the accused had appeared in court.<sup>1</sup> In this case it was impossible to observe this rule fully, since the decision had been made to hasten the time; comp. Mark xiv. 2. But they must at least try to save appearances as far as possible, and to offer the semblance of a first preliminary meeting, before that at which the sentence should be pronounced. The Synoptics, as was in harmony with the nature of the oral tradition, preserved only the remembrance of that which was historically conspicuous; John, in conformity with his ordinary course of action, omits the solemn session which was sufficiently well known through the Synoptic narrative, and restored the part of the facts which was omitted by them—no doubt, not for the purpose of materially completing them, but that he might not suffer the radiance of the glory of Jesus to be lost, which had shone forth in the meeting held in the house of Annas. *Luthardt* and *Weiss* think that, if John has related the scene in the house of Annas, it is only with a view to Peter's denial, which is connected with it, and which he wished to relate in order to show the fulfilment of the words of Jesus in xiii. 38. But if the story of this appearance had had this purpose only, it would have been sufficient to indicate it, without describing the scene in all its details.

*Hilgenfeld* explains the omission in John of the scene of the condemnation of Jesus by the Sanhedrim, by reason of the fact that the *Jewish Messiahship* of Jesus had been very strongly emphasized there, a thing which was displeasing to the pseudo-John. But with the freedom which the author used in respect to the history (according to this school), there was nothing easier for him than to modify the account of this scene, for example, by making the sentence of Jesus bear only upon the affirmation of His dignity as *Son of God*, which was perfectly in accordance with the spirit of his work. Besides, if the idea of the Messianic office was so repugnant to him, why should he have called it to mind from the first and even in the last words of his Gospel (i. 42-46 and xx. 31)? *Keim*, however, gets excited, and says: "Who is so blind . . . as to seek for truth in a narrative which—after having introduced the examination in the house of Annas as a fact of a decisive character—sets aside (*ignorirt*) in the most unpardonable way that which took place in the house of Caiaphas" (pp. 322, 323)! But what decisive result, then, did the meeting in Annas' house have? The result, according to John himself, was nothing, to the great annoyance of the enemies who counted on discovering some complaint against Him for the great judicial session which was about to follow. As to the session in the house of Caiaphas, it is by no means set aside (*ignorirt*), as we have just seen, since John very correctly and repeatedly assigns to it its place (ver. 24).—*Reuss*, in his *Histoire évangélique* (p. 663), expresses himself thus: "John says nothing, and we will add, without falling into an error, knows nothing of the official examination and of the trial before the court, because all this takes place with closed doors." We have proved, on the contrary, that John knows perfectly well the facts which he omits. How should he not have been aware of the judgment of Jesus by the Sanhedrim, if it were only through the oral tradition which passed into the Synoptics and through the Synoptics themselves, with which John was acquainted, as even *Reuss* himself now confesses. If, then, he

<sup>1</sup> *Schürer*, pp. 416, 417, according to *Sanhedrin*, iv. 1, v. 5.

did not relate this scene, it is because he did not wish to do so, and we know the reason why he did not. Though this fact may be contrary to the system of Reuss respecting the Fourth Gospel, it is nevertheless indisputable. As to *Renan*, with much more impartiality than the theologians, he is unsparing in his admiration of John's narrative. "Our author alone," he says; "represents Jesus as brought to the house of Annas, the father-in-law of Caiaphas. Josephus confirms the correctness of this account. . . . This circumstance, of which the first two Gospels give no hint, is a beam of light. How should a sectary, writing in Egypt or in Asia Minor, have known this? . . . It is a strong proof of the historical value of our Gospel" (pp. 522 and 407). In fact, the relationship of Annas and Caiaphas, which, as we shall see, is an important element in the explanation of the narrative, is a matter of information which John must have received at first hand, for Josephus himself does not mention this fact, although it is perfectly in accordance with his narrative.

### 1. Jesus before Annas.

Vv. 12-14. "*The cohort and the tribune and the officers of the Jews seized Jesus, therefore, and bound him, 13, and they led<sup>1</sup> him first to Annas; for he was father-in-law of Caiaphas, who was high-priest of that year.<sup>2</sup> 14. Caiaphas was he who had given this counsel to the Jews: that it was expedient that one man should die<sup>3</sup> for the people.*"—The word *πρῶτον*, *first*, contains a tacit correction of the Synoptics, according to which Jesus was led *directly* to the house of Caiaphas; comp. an altogether similar remark in iii. 24.—It has been supposed that this *in the first place*, or *first*, alludes to the subsequent sending of Jesus to Pilate; but see on vv. 24, 28. According to these verses, the understood *secondly* is certainly the sending to Caiaphas.—Annas had himself been high-priest during the years 6-15 of our era, thus about fifteen years before this time. We see in Josephus that he was the influential man of the period. John, however, gives us to understand that the true reason why Jesus was led at this moment to his house was rather his relationship to Caiaphas, the high-priest. By virtue of this relationship, the two personages constituted, as it were, but a single one. Comp. the expression in Luke iii. 2.—On vv. 13, 14, comp. xi. 50, 51. By establishing the identity of this personage with the one mentioned in ch. xi., John would give us to understand what kind of justice Jesus had to expect on the part of a judge who had already expressed himself in this way.

### 2. The first denial.

Vv. 15-18. "*Now Simon Peter followed Jesus, as well as another<sup>4</sup> disciple, and that disciple was known to the high-priest, and he entered in with Jesus into the court of the high-priest. 16. And Peter was standing without at the door;*

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  B D 6 Mnn.: *ἡγαγον* instead of *ἀπηγαγον*.  
— $\aleph$  B C D X  $\Delta$  I<sup>1919</sup> omit *αὐτον*.

<sup>2</sup> Cod. 225 adds after *πρῶτον*: *ἀπεστέλειεν οὖν αὐτον ο Αnνας δεδεμενον προς Καϊαφαν τον αρχιερα (Annas sent him therefore bound to Caiaphas the high-priest)*. Syrp adds the same words in the margin. Cyril reads after *εκεινον*:

*ἀπεστέλειαν δε αὐτον δεδεμενον προς Καϊαφαν τον αρχιερα* (comp. ver. 24).

<sup>3</sup>  $\aleph$  B C L X 13 Mnn. some Vss.: *ἀποθανειν* instead of *ἀπολεσθαι*.

<sup>4</sup>  $\aleph$  A B 5 Mnn. and probably It. Vulg. Syr. Cop. Sah. omit *ο (the)* before *αλλος* (*an*-other disciple).

the other disciple, who was known to the high-priest,<sup>1</sup> went out therefore and spoke to her who kept the door, and brought in<sup>2</sup> Peter. 17. The maid that kept the door, therefore, says to Peter, Art not thou also of this man's disciples? Peter answers, I am not. 18. Now the servants and the officers were standing there, having made a fire of charcoal, because it was cold; and Peter<sup>3</sup> was standing among them and warming himself."—While the Synoptics relate in a consecutive way the three denials of Peter, probably because in the oral preaching the narrative of this event formed an altogether peculiar little story, an ἀπομνημόνευμα, John separates the three acts of denial in the course of his narration, passing alternately from Peter to Jesus and from Jesus to Peter. This better articulated narrative certainly reproduces the true course of things, and nothing more clearly reveals in the author of our Gospel the witness of the facts, who through his own recollections exercised power over the received tradition. "The same superiority," says *Renan*, rightly, "in the account of Peter's denials. All is more circumstantial, better explained."—With the article ὁ, *the*, the term *the other disciple* could only be referred to the disciple whom Jesus loved, whose particular connection with Peter we have already ascertained in xiii. 21, 24. But this article is wanting in the Alexandrian documents and in the ancient Versions. Nothing, moreover, in the context justifies the use of the definite article. If we read, as we should, "another disciple," it may be John himself; this is the more common supposition. The periphrasis, however, of which he makes use in order to preserve his anonymous character is rather this: "the disciple whom Jesus loved" (xiii. 23, xix. 26). I formerly attempted to justify this change of expression by saying that "it was not the occasion for using a term of tenderness when the disciples had just abandoned their Master;" but this explanation is somewhat subtle. Did not John designate by this phrase some other disciple, his brother James, for example, whom he does not mention by *name* anywhere in his whole Gospel, any more than he does himself or his mother?—We do not know the relations which Zebedee and his sons may have had with the household of the high-priest. Perhaps the very profession of Zebedee had furnished the occasion for it. Thanks to these relations, this disciple had been able to enter within the priestly palace with the company, and soon he was able to gain admission for Peter, who had undoubtedly asked of him this service.

But of what high-priest does John mean to speak when he says in ver. 15: *into the court of the high-priest* (ἀνλή, more probably here the interior court than the palace itself)? On the one hand, if the relation of ἠκολούθει, *followed*, ver. 15, to ἀπήγαγον, *led him away*, ver. 13, is considered, it seems that there can be no question except of the palace of Annas. On the other hand, according to vv. 13, 14, how can we suppose that there can be a question of another high-priest than Caiaphas, who has just now expressly received the title? Undoubtedly, Annas is also called ἀρχιερεὶς (Acts iv. 6). *Schürer* has even shown that this title might be applied to all the members of the

<sup>1</sup> Instead of ος ἢ γνωστος τῷ ἀρχ., B C L

<sup>2</sup> B C L X some Mnn. ἠπέρειν Vulg. Syr. Cop. read καὶ before ο Πέτρος (and Peter also).

<sup>3</sup> N: εἰσηγγεκε instead of εἰσηγαγεν.

privileged families from which the high-priests were ordinarily taken. Nevertheless, this title has nowhere in our Gospel this broad sense, and it would be difficult indeed to believe that after having contrasted, as he has done in ver. 13, Caiaphas as "*the high-priest* of that year," with Annas, his *father-in-law*, John would designate this latter person, a few lines farther on, simply by the title of *high-priest*. How could the readers, who had never heard of Annas, have supposed that he also bore this title? It is, therefore, clearly the house of Caiaphas of which John means to speak, if he has not written in an unintelligible way. But, in that case, it is asked how the relations which the disciple sustained to the high-priest Caiaphas and the members of his household could open to him the entrance into the abode of Annas, to whom Jesus was first led. There is but one solution to this question, which the narrative of John itself suggests, setting aside that of the Synoptics; it is that these two personages lived in the same palace. The bond of close relationship which united them explains this circumstance, and it is for this reason, undoubtedly, that John has so expressly noticed this particular. *Meyer* is wrong, therefore, in saying that the text does not offer the least indication in favor of this opinion. John's account leads directly to it.

The Hebrews very commonly had female doorkeepers (*Josephus, Antiq.* vii. 2, 1; *Acts* xii. 13; 2 *Sam.* iv. 6, according to the text of the LXX).—The *καί*, *also* ("Art not thou *also*"), shows that this woman already knew the unnamed disciple as one of the adherents of Jesus.—The three denials of Peter, as *Luthardt* observes, have three distinct historical starting-points, which are more or less distributed among the four evangelists: 1. The introduction of Peter into the court by a friend, who was himself known as a disciple of Jesus; 2. The recollection which had been retained of Peter by those who had seen him at the time of the arrest of Jesus; 3. His Galilean dialect. To these external circumstances, which called forth his trial, was added an internal one which facilitated his fall: the recollection of the blow which he had struck, and which exposed him, more than all the rest, to the danger of being involved in the judgment of his Master. Fear therefore combined with presumption; and thus was the warning which Jesus had given him verified: "*The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak.*"

The *δοῦλοι*, *servants*, ver. 18, designate the domestic servants attached to the priestly house; the *ὑπηρέται*, *officers*, are the official servants of the Sanhedrim, charged with the police duties of the temple.—The last words of ver. 18: *Peter was standing with them and warming himself*, are repeated literally in ver. 25. They are placed here, as a stepping-stone with a view to the approaching resumption of the story relating to Peter, after the appearance of Jesus in the house of Annas. Hence it follows: 1. That there is an absolute impossibility in the way of placing the last two denials in another locality than the first; and 2. That these last two denials took place, not *after*, but *during* the examination of Jesus.—The verbs in the imperfect tense are picturesque, and signify that the situation described continues during the whole examination which is about to be related, so that, accord-

ing to the narrative, the scene of vv. 25, 26 (Peter) took place simultaneously with that of vv. 19-23 (Jesus).

### 3. Appearance in the house of Annas :

Vv. 19-21. "*The high-priest therefore asked Jesus concerning his disciples and his doctrine. 20. Jesus answered him : I have spoken<sup>1</sup> openly to the world ; I have always taught in open synagogue<sup>2</sup> and in the temple, where all<sup>3</sup> the Jews come together, and I have said nothing in secret. 21. Why askest thou me? <sup>4</sup> Ask<sup>4</sup> those who have heard me what I have said to them : behold, these know what I have said.*"—It is generally held that, as the examination took place in the house of Annas, it was he who directed the investigation. But this would imply that the high-priest of vv. 13-16 was Annas, which we have seen to be contrary to the natural meaning of John's narrative. This session was a purely private one; it had its necessary place, as we have seen, in the course of the trial; the presence of the officer in ver. 22 implies the official character of the scene. The duty of presiding over it fell, therefore, to the high-priest officially. It has been supposed that Annas was exercising functions here in the character of *Ab-beth-din* (chief of the court of justice). But this dignity appertained to the high-priest himself (*Schürer*, p. 413). *Keim* rightly says (certainly not to support the narrative of John): "If Caiaphas was truly the acting high-priest and, at the same time, the soul of the sudden onset which was proposed against Jesus, it belonged to him, and not to his father-in-law, to acquaint himself with the matter and to make a report to the Sanhedrim" (iii. p. 322). If it was otherwise, according to John, what purpose would the characterizing of Caiaphas, in ver. 13, have served? When, in ver. 22, the officer says to Jesus : *Answerest thou the high-priest so?* it is unnatural to think of another personage than the actual high-priest, the one who has just been expressly designated as such in vv. 13, 14. *Leuss* brings forward in opposition to our view ver. 24, in which the high-priest must necessarily be *another* personage than the one who is called thus in ver. 19. At the first glance, this observation appears just. But if Jesus was led away to the house of Annas, it was quite naturally Annas who gave the order to conduct Him to the house of Caiaphas, while yet it would not follow from this fact that it was Annas himself who presided over the preliminary session.

The question proposed to Jesus had as its design to draw from Him an answer suited to give a ground for His condemnation. For there was embarrassment felt respecting the course to be pursued in this matter, as the recourse to the false witnesses proves.—What is asked of Jesus is not the names of His disciples, as if the question were of a list of accomplices; it is information as to the number of His partisans and the principles which serve them as a standard.—Jesus, understanding that they were only

<sup>1</sup> ⳑ A B C L X Y Δ : λελαληκα, instead of ελαλησα.

<sup>2</sup> T. R. reads τη before συναγωγή (the synagogue) with A and some Mnn. only.

<sup>3</sup> T. R. with some Mnn. only : παντοθεν

(from all quarters) ⸈ with 10 Mjj. (Υ Γ Δ Δ etc.): παντοτε (always); ⳑ A B C L X II : παντες (all).

<sup>4</sup> T. R. with Byz. : επερωτας and επερωτησον; Alex.: ερωτας and ερωτησον.

seeking to wrest from Him an expression which might be turned to account against Him, simply appeals to the publicity of His teaching. He is not the head of a secret society, nor the propagator of principles which fear the light of day.—*Συναγωγῆς*, without an article (according to the true reading): *in synagogal assembly*; the word *ἱερόν*, *temple*, has the article, because this edifice is unique. When Jesus instructed His disciples in private, it was not for the purpose of telling them something different from what He declared in public.—The testimony of the ancient Versions decides in favor of the Alexandrian reading: “*all the Jews* ;” not, the Jews *from all parts* or *continually*.

Ver. 22, 23. “*When he had said this, one of the officers, who was at his side, struck him with a rod, saying, Answerest thou the high-priest so?* 23. *Jesus answered him, If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil; but if I have spoken well, why dost thou smite me?*”—The answer of Jesus certainly contained a tacit rebuke intended for the one who thus interrogated Him. An officer who wished to court the favor of his chief takes occasion to remind Jesus of the respect due to the ruler of Israel. The word *πάπισμα* properly means: a blow with a rod. Undoubtedly in Matt. v. 39 the verb *πατίζειν* is taken in the sense of striking in the face. The proper sense, however, is here the more natural one; comp. the term *δέρειν*, *to flay*, ver. 23. *Μαρτυρεῖν*: to prove by a regular giving of testimony.—Jesus does not literally fulfil here His own precept, Matt. v. 39; but by this reply, full of dignity and gentleness, He endeavors to bring the man to himself, which is precisely the moral fulfilment of that precept.

Ver. 24. “*Annas therefore<sup>1</sup> sent him bound to Caiaphas, the high-priest.*”—This verse has always perplexed those who have held that at ver. 15 Jesus was led to the house of Caiaphas, and that the session which John has just described is the great session of the Sanhedrim, which is related by the Synoptics. This twofold error is what has occasioned the transposition of this verse in some documents to a place after ver. 13 (see the critical note on that verse). It is this likewise which has led some interpreters, such as *Calvin, Lücke, Tholuck, de Wette, Langen*, to take *ἀπέστειλαν* in the sense of the pluperfect, *had sent*. But when the aorist has the sense of the pluperfect, the context clearly indicates it. Precisely the contrary is here the case. Besides, the particle *οὖν*, *therefore*, if it is authentic, excludes this explanation, and it is even probable that this is precisely the reason which has made some reject it and others change it into *δέ*, *now*: “*Now, Annas had sent. . .*” By inserting this notice here, the evangelist simply wished, as by the *πρῶτον*, *first*, of ver. 13, to reserve a place expressly for the session in the house of Caiaphas, which was indeed otherwise important, and of which he does not give an account. Comp. ver. 1 (for the scene in Gethsemane) and ver. 5 (for the kiss of Judas). *Luteroth* gives to this verse a sentimental cast. There is, according to him, a picture here; John means to say: Behold! This Jesus, thus struck by the officer, was standing there with His hands bound, in the condition in which *Annas had* [previ-

<sup>1</sup> T. R. (C\*) with B C L X I<sup>14</sup> some Mnn., δε (now); 7 with 13 Mjj. (A etc.) omits the reads οὖν (therefore); 8 Syr<sup>ch</sup> some Mnn.: particie altogether.

ously] *sent Him to Caiaphas!* But this sense has nothing in common with the simplicity and sobriety of the apostolic narrative; it implies, moreover, the pluperfect sense as here given to the aorist.—Jesus had undoubtedly been unbound during the examination; after this scene, Annas causes Him to be bound again, in order to send Him to the house of Caiaphas. Probably He was unbound a second time during the session of the Sanhedrim. This explains why in Matt. xxvii. 2 and Mark xv. 1, He is bound anew at the time of leading Him away to Pilate.—*To Caiaphas*: in the part of the palace where Caiaphas lived, and where were the official apartments and the hall for the meetings of the Sanhedrim. This body had been called together in the interval; for all the members were in Jerusalem for the feast. The title of high-priest reminds us of the wholly official character of the session which was in preparation, as well as that of the place where it occurred.

#### 4. Second and third denial:

Vv. 25-27. "*And Simon Peter was standing and warming himself. They said therefore to him, Art not thou also one of his disciples? He denied and said, I am not. 26. One of the servants of the high-priest, a kinsman of him whose ear Peter cut off, says to him, Did I not see thee in the garden with him? 27. Peter denied again; and immediately the cock crew.*"—As far as ver. 18, according to John, all has happened in the house of Annas; and as ver. 25 expressly places us again in the situation of ver. 18, it is evident that the following facts also occur at his house; it is the same court, the same fire, the same persons; so that those who, like *Weiss*, are unwilling to admit that Caiaphas and Annas lived in two different apartments of the same priestly palace, are obliged to hold that Matthew and Mark have made a mistake in placing the denial of Peter in the house of Caiaphas. As for ourselves, we have already stated the reasons which seem to us to support the contrary opinion.—The sending of Jesus to Caiaphas, mentioned already in ver. 24, in reality followed the last denial (ver. 27). For the facts of vv. 25-27 took place simultaneously with vv. 19-23. This circumstance explains the incident, related by Luke, of the look which Jesus cast upon Peter (xxii. 61). Jesus crossed the court to go from the apartments of Annas to those of Caiaphas (ver. 24). He heard at this moment the cock-crowing (ver. 27); and then it was that His eye met that of Peter. The epithet *δεδεμένον*, *bound*, makes us understand more fully the impression produced on the unfaithful disciple by the sight of his Master in this condition.

The subject of *ειπον*, *they said* (ver. 25), is indefinite. According to Matthew, it is a maid-servant who sees Peter approaching the gate to go forth from the court to the front of the house. According to Mark, it is the same maid-servant who had already troubled him in the first instance and who denounces him to the servants who were gathered about the fire. In Luke, it is indefinitely *ιτερος*, *another* person. It is probable that the portress spoke of Peter to one of her companions, who denounced him to the assembled servants. From this group came forth instantly the question addressed to Peter.—After the second denial, Peter seems to have played

the bold part, and to have set himself to speak more freely with the persons present. But his Galilean accent was soon noticed, and attracted the more particular attention of a kinsman of Malchus, a fact which occasioned the third denial.—John does not mention the imprecations which Matthew puts into Peter's mouth. If, then, any one was animated by hostile feelings towards this disciple, it was the first evangelist, and not the author of our narrative. Though he does not speak of Peter's repentance, the narrative of the scene in xxi. 15 ff. evidently implies it.—The story of the denial of Peter is, besides those of the multiplication of the loaves and of the entrance of Jesus into Jerusalem, the only one which is related at once by John and the Synoptics. There is no discourse here to be accounted for, as in ch. vi., and no series of events to be explained, as in ch. xii. John's purpose, therefore, could only have been to reproduce in all their grievous reality the two simultaneous scenes of the appearance of the Master before the authorities and the disciple's denial, which had formed the prelude of the Passion. In any case, we may discover here how the oral tradition related the facts with less of life and flexibility than is done by the pen of an eye-witness. The latter alone has reproduced the minutest articulations of the history; and it is not without reason that *Renan* speaks of "its varied and sharply defined points."

## II. *The Trial before Pilate*: xviii. 28-xix. 16.

Had the Romans, in making Judea a province of the empire, taken away from the Jews the right of capital punishment? Our narrative affirms this positively by putting in the mouths of the latter the words (ver. 31): "*It is not permitted us to put any one to death.*" To this have been objected the execution of Stephen, Acts vii. 57 ff., and the permission which Titus had granted the Jews to put foreigners, even Romans, to death who had invaded the inclosure of the temple court (Josephus, *Antiq.* vi. 2, 4). But the first event was an extra-legal act of popular fury, and the permission given by Titus is quite an exceptional case. According to the Talmud, as according to John, the right of inflicting capital punishment belonged no longer to the Sanhedrim. And it was precisely at the time of the judgment of Jesus that this change took place, "forty years before the destruction of the temple."<sup>1</sup> Probably, in the time which followed the annexation, the governors desired to use moderation towards the conquered people. But the despotic Pilate had reduced the Jews to the common law of the provinces. This was the reason which obliged the rulers to bring Jesus before this governor in order to obtain from him the confirmation and execution of the sentence which they had just pronounced.—Pilate was from the year 26 procurator of Judea, under the order of the proconsul of Syria. He was deposed in 36 by Vitellius and sent to Rome, to be judged there for all the wrongs which he had committed. According to "Greek historians" (Euseb. ii. 7), he was put to death under Caligula.—Such were the reasons

<sup>1</sup> *Sanhedr.* fol. 24, 2: *Quadragesima annis capitalia ab Israele. ante vastatum templum ablata sunt iudicia*

which made the Jews hold a third session—that *of the morning*, which took place very early, no longer in the high-priest's house, but in the vicinity of the temple, either in the famous hall paved with mosaic (*Uischath hagga-zith*), situated in the interior court at the south of the temple, or in the synagogue *Beth midrasch*, between the court of the women and the outer court (see *Keim*, III. p. 351). This is confirmed by Matthew (xxvii. 1), Mark (xvi. 1), and especially Luke (xxii. 66 ff.)<sup>1</sup> The last mentioned has preserved for us the most complete account of this session, perhaps mingling in it some particulars borrowed from the great session in the night, which he passes over in silence. In any case, the examination and the judgment of Jesus must have been repeated a second time, though summarily, and confirmed in this morning session, which was the only legal and plenary one (*πάντες*, *all*, Matt.). We must observe the expression of Matthew, *ὥστε θανατώσαι αὐτόν*, *to put him to death*, which indicates the seeking for *ways and means* to succeed in obtaining from Pilate the execution of the sentence, as well as the expression of Luke: "*They led him into their assembly*," ver. 66, which can only refer to the passage from the house of Caiaphas (ver. 54) to one of the two meeting-halls near the temple, of which we have just spoken.

The Jews ask Pilate to confirm their sentence *without an examination* (ver. 30). The latter refuses; this is the first phase of the negotiations: vv. 28–32. Then they set forth a *political* accusation: He made Himself a king. Pilate judges this accusation unfounded; then he makes two ineffectual attempts to deliver Jesus with the support of the people; this is the second phase: ver. 33–xix. 6. The Jews then bring forward a *religious* charge: He made Himself Son of God. On hearing this accusation Pilate endeavors still more to deliver Jesus; this is the third phase: xix. 7–12a. At this moment, the Jews, seeing their prey ready to escape them, put aside all shame, and employ the odious expedient of *personal* intimidation to make the judge's conscience yield. On this path they suffer themselves to be carried away even to the point of the denial of their dearest hope—that of the Messiah; they declare themselves vassals of Cæsar; this is the fourth phase: xix. 12b–16.

Ver. 28. "*They lead Jesus therefore from Caiaphas to the Prætorium. Now it was early. And they did not themselves enter into the Prætorium, that they might not be defiled, but that<sup>2</sup> they might eat the Passover.*"—The *Prætorium* was at Rome the place where the prætor sat when he administered justice. This name had been applied to the palaces of the Roman governors in the provinces. Most interpreters hold that this term designates here the palace of Herod, which was in the western part of the upper city. In proof of this the passage of Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 14, 8, is cited, where it is said that "*Florus lived at that time (τότε) in the royal palace;*" but this passage proves precisely that the Roman governor did not ordinarily live there. It is more probable that Pilate occupied a palace

<sup>1</sup> *Lightfoot*, *Hor. Hebr.* in Matt. xxvii. 1. *Keim*: "The day meeting was required to complete, in point of legality, that of the night. For the meetings of the Sanhedrim, especially

in the case of a capital judgment, were required to be held in the day-time and in the morning before *noon has eaten or drunk.*"

<sup>2</sup>  $\aleph$  A B C  $\Delta$  reject the second *wa*.

contiguous to the citadel Antonia, where the Roman garrison was stationed, at the north-west corner of the temple. It is there, at all events, that tradition places the starting-point of the *Via Dolorosa*.—*Πρωί* (T. R. *πρωτα*), in the early morning, includes the time from three to six o'clock (Mark xiii. 35). The Roman courts opened their sessions at any hour after sunrise (*Westcott*). Pilate, as we have seen, was forewarned, since the previous evening, of what was taking place, and he had no doubt consented to receive the Jews at this early hour.

The scruple which prevents the Jews from entering into the governor's house places us again face to face with the contradiction which seems to exist between the narrative of John and that of the Synoptics. If, as these latter seem to say, the Jews had already on the previous evening celebrated the Paschal meal, how can we explain the fact that, through defiling themselves by contact with the leaven which would necessarily be found in a Gentile house, they fear that they may be unable to celebrate this meal on this same evening? The only way of escaping this contradiction, it seems, would be to give a wider sense to the expression *to eat the Passover*, by referring it, not to the Paschal meal properly so called, but to the food of the feast in general, such as the unleavened bread and the flesh of the peace-offerings which were celebrated during the seven days of the feast. Some passages are thought to have been found in the Old Testament where the word *Passover* is taken in this more general sense; thus Deut. xvi. 2, 3: "*Thou shalt sacrifice the Passover to the Lord, of the flock and of the herd, and with it (these meats) thou shalt eat unleavened bread seven days.*" Comp. the analogous expression 2 Chron. xxx. 22 (literally): "*And they ate the feast (the feast-sacrifices) seven days, offering sacrifices of peace offerings and praising the Lord;*" 2 Chron. xxxv. 7-9: "*And Josiah gave to those of the people who were there lambs and kids, to the number of thirty thousand, all of them for Passover offerings, and three thousand bullocks, of the king's substance.*" To confirm this conclusion it is alleged that, according to the Talmud, the defilement which the Jews would have contracted by entering the Prætorium would have continued in any case only until the end of the day, and consequently would not have prevented them from eating the Paschal meal in the evening.—But the passages cited do not prove what they would need to prove. As to the first (Deut. xvi. 2, 3), the term *Passover* is applied exclusively, in vv. 5, 6, which immediately follow, to the Paschal lamb; hence it follows that in ver. 2 the expression *of the herd and of the flock* is not an explanatory apposition of the word *pesach* (Passover), but a supplementary addition by which all the secondary sacrifices which complete the Paschal supper during the course of the week are designated. At all events, if the term *Passover* really included here, together with the Paschal lamb, all the other sacrifices of the feast, it would not follow therefrom that it could designate, as would be the case in our passage, these last apart from the first. As to the *with it*, it refers to all the sacrificial meats which were to be accompanied by unleavened bread during the entire week.—In 2 Chron. ch. xxx. the name *Passover* is applied in vv. 15, 17, 18 exclusively to the Paschal lamb. Why, then, should the chronicler in ver. 22

substitute for the proper term : to eat the Passover, the more general expression *to eat the feast*, if it was not because he wished now to speak of the sacrifices of the feast, *exclusive of* the eating of the Paschal lamb ? Besides, the reading : *and they ate (vajokelou) the feast*, is very doubtful. The LXX certainly read : *vajokellou, and they finished the feast* ; for they translate : *καὶ συνετέλεσαν*.—In the third passage (2 Chron. xxxv. 7–9) the distinction between the lambs or kids which were intended to serve for the Paschal meal (*pesachim*) and the bullocks which were consecrated to the other sacrifices and feasts is obvious.—But even supposing that in some passages of the Old Testament the term *Passover* had received from the context a wider meaning than ordinary, would it follow from this that a phrase so common in the New Testament, in Josephus and in the Talmud, as that of *eating the Passover*, could be applied, without any explanatory indication, to entirely different meals from the Paschal supper, and this even to the exclusion of the latter ?

As to the objection derived from the duration of the defilement which the Jews would have contracted : 1. It is impossible to form any certain conclusion, with reference to the time of Jesus, from a passage of the Rabbi Maimonides written about the year 1200. 2. This passage refers to a defilement arising from contact with dead animals, etc., and not to the defilement arising from leaven, and with special relation to the Paschal feast. The same is the case with the examples borrowed from other kinds of defilement (Lev. xv. 5 ff., 19 ff.). After the analogy of Num. ix. 6 ff., the Jews would simply have been obliged to put off the celebration of the Passover until the 14th of the following month. 3. If the question were only of the feast-meals in general, the members of the Sanhedrim might have abstained altogether from taking part in them ; for these meals were voluntary ; the Paschal supper alone did not allow of abstention.<sup>1</sup> 4. The defilement thus contracted would, in any case, have forced the priests, who were members of the Sanhedrim, to abstain from participating *in the sacrifice of the lamb* in the afternoon, an abstention which was incompatible with their official duty.

For all these reasons it is impossible for me to adopt the opinion of many and learned interpreters who refer the expression *to eat the Passover* in our verse to the peace-offering (the *Chagigah*), which the Jews offered on the 16th of Nisan at mid-day ; we will mention among the modern writers only *Tholuck, Olshausen, Hengstenberg, Wieseler, Hofmann, Lange, Riggenbach, Bäumlein, Langen, Luthardt, Kirehner* and *Keil*.

The pronoun *αὐτοί, themselves*, contrasts the Jews, with their Levitical purity, to Jesus, whom nothing could any longer defile, so defiled was He already in their eyes. He was immediately delivered over to the governor, and introduced into the Prætorium. From this time, therefore, Pilate will go from the Prætorium to the Jews (vv. 29, 38, xix. 4–12) and from the Jews to the Prætorium (ver. 33, xix. 1, 9). *Keim* judges this situation to be historically impossible, and jests about this ambulant judge, this *peripa-*

<sup>1</sup> See the Article of *Andree* already cited (xiii. 1) in the *Beweis des Glaubens*, 1870.

etic negotiator, whom the narrative of John presents to us. But the apostle clearly perceived that this situation had an exceptional character, and he has precisely explained it by this ver. 28. Pilate does not feel himself free in his position with regard to the Jews; the sequel shows this only too clearly. This is the reason why he bears with their scruples.—The *first position* taken by the Jews :

Vv. 29-32. “Pilate therefore went out<sup>1</sup> to them and said,<sup>2</sup> What accusation do you bring against<sup>3</sup> this man? 30. They answered him, saying, If he were not an evil doer,<sup>4</sup> we should not have delivered him to thee. 31. Pilate therefore<sup>5</sup> said to them, Take him yourselves, and judge him according to your law. Whereupon the Jews answered him, It is not permitted us to put any one to death; 32, that the word might be fulfilled which Jesus had spoken,<sup>6</sup> signifying by what death he should die.”—The ordinary residence of the governor was Cæsarea; but he went to Jerusalem at the time of the feasts. Pilate was fond of displaying before the eyes of the people on these occasions the pomp of Roman majesty. Philo (*Leg. ad Caium*) represents him as a proud, obstinate, intractable man. Nevertheless, it is probable that the fanaticism of the Jews was also an important element in the contentions which they continually had with him. “All the acts of Pilate which are known to us,” says *Reinan*, “show him to have been a good administrator.” This portrait is somewhat flattering; but it is partially confirmed by the picture which Josephus himself has drawn of his government, *Antiq.* xviii. 2-4.—*Oñv, therefore*: in consequence of the fact that the Jews were unwilling to enter into his palace.

The answer of the Jews to Pilate (ver. 30) is skilful; it is dictated by two reasons: on the one hand, they endeavor to keep the largest possible share of their ancient autonomy, by continuing in the main the judges, and leaving to Pilate the part of executioner; and, on the other hand, they undoubtedly are also apprehensive of not succeeding before him with their political and religious grievances. The manœuvre was well contrived. But Pilate understands them; he refuses the position which they wish to give him. He plays cautiously with them. Entering apparently into their thought, delighted at finding a means of relieving himself of the affair, he replies without hesitation: “Very good! Since you wish to be sole judges of the case, be so! Take the accused and punish Him yourselves (*ἑμεῖς*, ver. 31), of course within the limits of your competency.” The Sanhedrim had, in fact, certain disciplinary rights, like that of excommunicating, scourging, etc. There was no need of Pilate in order to inflict these punishments; only this was not death. Some interpreters have thought that Pilate really authorized them to put Jesus to death, but with this understood reservation: “If you can and dare” (*Hengstenberg*). But this is to make Pilate say yes and no at the same time. XIX. 6 proves nothing in favor of this meaning, as we shall see.

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  adds *εξω* after Πιλατος, B C L X Syr. before *προς αυτους*; others after these words.

<sup>2</sup> B C L X: *φησιν* instead of *ειπεν*.

<sup>3</sup>  $\aleph$  B omit *κατα*.

<sup>4</sup>  $\aleph$  reads *κακον ποιησας*, B L *κακον ποιων*, instead of *κακοποιος*.

<sup>5</sup> B C omit *ουν*; A K U II read *δε*.

<sup>6</sup>  $\aleph$  omits *ον ειπεν*.

This answer did not suit the Jews ; for they wished that, at any cost, Jesus might be put to death. It forced them, therefore, to make confession of their dependence, at least in this regard (ver. 31). And this circumstance seems to the evangelist significant (ver. 32); for, if they had been their own masters, or had allowed themselves to be carried away, as afterwards in the murder of Stephen, to act as if they still were so, Jesus would have undergone the Jewish, and not the Roman punishment ; He would have been stoned ; this was the punishment of the false prophets, according to the Talmud (see *Westcott*). But He would not have been lifted up upon the cross, from which, by His calmness, His submission, His patience, His pardon, His love, He incessantly draws all men to Himself as He had announced beforehand (iii. 14, viii. 28, xii. 32); what a difference from the tumultuous punishment of stoning! Comp. also xix. 36, 37.

The *second position* taken by the Jews :

Vv. 33-35. "*Pilate entered again therefore into the Prætorium, and he called Jesus and said to him, Art thou the king of the Jews?* 34. *Jesus answered him:*<sup>1</sup> *Sayest thou<sup>2</sup> this of thyself,<sup>3</sup> or did others tell it thee of me?* 35. *Pilate answered: Am I a Jew? Thine own nation and the chief priests<sup>4</sup> have delivered thee to me; what hast thou done?*"—John's narrative evidently presents a gap here. There is nothing in what precedes to give a reason for the question of Pilate to Jesus: *Art thou the king of the Jews?* Such an inquiry implies, therefore, an expression on the part of the accusers which gives occasion for it. This supposition is changed into certainty when we compare the narrative of the Synoptics, particularly that of Luke. "*We found him,*" say the Jews on approaching Pilate, "*troubling the nation, forbidding to pay tribute to Cæsar, saying that he is the Christ, the King*" (xxiii. 2). Luke, as well as Mark and Matthew, has omitted the whole first phase of the accusation, which has just been related by John. The Synoptics begin their narrative at the moment when the Jews come down again to their more humble part as accusers, and concede to Pilate his position as judge. Hence it follows that John, after having supplied in what precedes that which the Synoptics had omitted, now implies as known to his readers the political accusation mentioned by them. We see how intimate and constant is the relation between his narrative and theirs. *Keil* concludes from the words *he called Jesus*, that up to this moment Jesus had remained outside. But see above. He called Him *aside* in the Prætorium itself, to a place where he could speak with Him alone. To his question, Pilate certainly expected a frank negative answer. But the position was not as simple as he imagined. There was a distinction to be made here, not to the thought of Pilate, but to that of Jesus. In the political sense of the term *king of the Jews*, the only one known to Pilate, Jesus might reject this title; but in the religious sense which every believing Jew gave to it and in which it was equivalent to Messiah, Jesus must accept it, whatever the consequences of this avowal might be. Jesus must know, then, whether this title, with regard to which Pilate was interrogating Him, was

<sup>1</sup> 9 Mj. (A B C etc.) omit αυτω.

<sup>2</sup> N : ειπας instead of λεγεις.

<sup>3</sup> B C L : απο σεαυτου instead of απ' εαυτου.

<sup>4</sup> N be : ο αρχιερευς (the high-priest).

put forward by Pilate himself, or whether it had been put forward by the Jews in the conversation which he had just had with them. The objections of *Meyer* and *Weiss* (in his *Commentary*) against this explanation do not seem to me sufficient to shake it. According to *Meyer*, Jesus asks of Pilate simply an explanation which He had *the right* to ask. But He nevertheless did it with some *purpose*. According to *Weiss*, Jesus wished to know whether He must now give an explanation respecting the Messianic idea! Finally, according to *Tholuck*, *Luthardt*, *Keil*, etc., He thereby called Pilate's attention to the suspicious source of this accusation (*others, the Jews*). It would, in that case, have been more simple to answer by a *No* only; but, after this, the really affirmative answer of Jesus in vv. 36, 37 would become an absurdity. These two verses are compatible with the question of Jesus only on our explanation, which is that of *Olshausen*, *Neander*, *Ewald*, and at present, it seems to me, of *Weiss* himself (*Life of Jesus*, II. p. 563). We must conclude from these words that Jesus had not Himself heard the accusation of the rulers, and consequently that He was already, as we have stated, ver. 28, in the Prætorium at the time when it was brought forward by them.

Pilate, not understanding clearly what is the aim of this distinction, answers abruptly: "What have I to do with your Jewish subtleties?" There is profound contempt in the antithesis: ἐγὼ . . . Ἰουδαῖος (*I . . . a Jew?*). Then, abandoning the Jewish jargon which he had allowed his accusers to impose on him for the moment, he interrogates Him as a frank and simple Roman: "Now then, to the point! By what fault hast thou brought upon thyself all that which is taking place at this moment?"

Vv. 36, 37. "*Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world, my servants would have fought that I might not be delivered to the Jews. But now is my kingdom not from hence. 37. Thereupon Pilate said to him, Art thou a king, then? Jesus answered him, Thou sayest it; I am a king; I was born and am come into the world to bear witness to the truth.*" *Whoever is of the truth hears my voice.*"—Jesus does not answer directly; but the answer appears from what He is about to say. He certainly possesses a kingship; this kingship, however, is not of a nature to disturb Pilate.—The expression ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, *of this world*, is not synonymous with ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, *in this world*. For the kingdom of Jesus is certainly realized and developed here on earth; but it does not have its *origin* from earth, from the human will and earthly force. Jesus gives as a proof of this the manner in which He has surrendered Himself to the Jews. His *servants* are that multitude of adherents who had surrounded Him on Palm-day, and not merely, as *Lücke* and *Luthardt* suppose, hypothetical beings: "the servants whom I should have in that case." The meaning given by *Bengel* and *Stier*: *the angels*, could not have been even dimly seen by Pilate.—The attempt has been made to give to νῦν, *now*, a temporal sense: "My kingdom is not now of this world, but it will be otherwise hereafter." But, at the coming of the Lord, His kingdom will be no more *of* this world than it is to-day. *Now* must be taken, as often, in the logical sense: it contrasts the

<sup>1</sup> B L Y 10 Mm. It<sup>all</sup> omit one of the two εἰμαι, the other before εἰς τουτο.

εγω which are read here by T. R., one after <sup>2</sup> N: περι της αληθειας instead of τη αληθεια.

ever-present reality of the truth with the non-existence of error.—Pilate certainly expected a simple denial. His answer expresses surprise. The meaning of the particle *οὐκ οὐν*, if it were accented *οὐκ οὐν*, would be : *certainly not*. Pilate would say : “Thou art certainly not a king,” with or without an interrogation point. But the reply of Jesus : “Thou sayest it,” by which He appropriates to Himself the contents of Pilate’s words while reaffirming them for Himself, favors the accentuation *οὐκ οὐν*, *not . . . then*. “It is, then, not false, the claim that is imputed to thee?”—The affirmative formula employed by Jesus : *Thou sayest it*, is foreign to the classic Greek and even to the Old Testament, but it is very common with the Rabbis. Its meaning cannot be that which *Reuss* would give to it (*Hist. év.*, p. 676) : “It is *thou* who sayest that I am a king ; as for me, I am come into the world to bear testimony, . . . ” which would mean simply : I am not a *king*, but a preacher of the truth, a *prophet*. In this sense, a *σί, thou*, in contrast with an *ἐγώ, I*, would have been absolutely necessary ; and then, a *but*, to contrast the saying of Jesus with that of Pilate. Besides, the meaning of the formula : *thou sayest it*, is well known ; comp. Matt. xxvi. 64.—*οὐ* might signify : *seeing that* : “Thou sayest it rightly, *seeing that* I really am such.” It is more natural, however, to explain this conjunction in the sense of *that* : “Thou sayest (it) well, *that* I am a king.” The importance of the idea makes Jesus feel the need of again formulating it expressly.—*Hengstenberg* separates altogether from this declaration the following words, which he applies simply to the *prophetic* office of Jesus Christ. But it is very evident that Jesus means to explain by what follows the sense in which He is a *king*. He comes to conquer the world, and for this end His only weapon is to bear witness to the truth ; His people are recruited from all men who open themselves to the truth. The first of the two consecutive *ἐγώ, I*, which are read in the T. R., must be rejected. Jesus certainly did not say : “I am a king, *I*.” The two *εἰς τοῦτο, for this*, refer to the following *ἵνα (that)*, contrary to the translation of *Ostervald* and *Arnaud* : “I was born for this (to be a king) and . . . ”—“*I was born*” refers to the fact of birth which is common to Him with all men, while the words : “I am come into the world” set forth the special *mission* with a view to which He has appeared here on earth. It is His work as prophet which is the foundation of His kingly office. The truth, the revelation of God—this is the sceptre with which He bears sway over the earth. This mode of conquest which Jesus here unveils to Pilate is the opposite of that by which the Roman power was formed, and *Lange* brings out with much reason that, as xii. 25 contained the judgment of the Greek genius, this declaration of Jesus to Pilate contains the judgment of the Roman genius by the Gospel.—The expression *to be of the truth* recalls to mind iii. 21, vii. 17, viii. 47, x. 16, etc. It denotes the moral disposition to receive the truth and to put oneself under its holy power when it presents itself in living form in the person of Jesus Christ. By the word *whoever*, Jesus addressed no longer merely the conscience of the judge, but also that of the man, in Pilate (*Hengstenberg*).

Ver. 38. “*Pilate says to him, What is truth? And after he had said this, he went out again to the Jews and says to them, As for me, I find no crime in*

him."—Pilate's exclamation is neither the expression of a soul eager for the truth (the Fathers), nor that of a heart in despair, which has long sought it in vain (*Olshausen*). It is the profession of a frivolous scepticism, such as is often met with in the man of the world, and particularly in statesmen, who are quite indifferent in general to this class of questions; witness the manner in which Napoleon was accustomed to speak of ideologists! If Pilate had seriously sought for the truth, it would have been the moment to find it and lay hold of it. In any case, what he is now convinced of is that the person whom he has before him, whether He is a dreamer or a sage, is not a rival of Caesar. Thus with "that broad sentiment of justice and civil government which," as *Renan* says, "the most ordinary Roman carried with him everywhere," he declares to the Jews his conviction of the innocence of Jesus as to the political accusation raised against Him.

After this, what was his duty? To discharge Jesus purely and simply. But, fearing to displease the Jews, who had well-founded reasons to accuse him to his superiors, he wishes to avoid taking a step which would make them his sworn enemies, and he has recourse to a series of expedients. The first is not related by John; it is the remitting of the affair to Herod, on account of the mention which had been made of the Galilean origin of Jesus in the accusation of the rulers (Luke xxiii. 5); this scene is described by Luke xxiii. 6-12; it is omitted by John as well known and not having led to any result. It was the appearance before Pilate which John was especially anxious to reproduce. In the declaration which, in John, closes ver. 38, are united the two expressions of Pilate related by Luke xxiii. 4, 14, which preceded and followed the sending of Jesus to Herod.—The second expedient is that of which John gives an account very summarily in vv. 39, 40, and which is related in detail by the Synoptics.

Vv. 39, 40. "*But you have a custom that I should release unto you a prisoner at the Passover feast. Will you therefore that I release unto you the king of the Jews?*" 40. *They all' cried out therefore again,<sup>2</sup> saying, Not this man, but Barabbas! Now Barabbas was a robber.*"—In the very brief narrative of John with relation to this episode, it is Pilate who seems to take the initiative in the proposal made to the people, while, in the dramatic picture of Mark, it is the people who rush forward with loud cries and demand the liberation of a prisoner. Evidently there is a vacancy here in John like that which we have noticed between ver. 32 and ver. 33. It is easy to establish the harmony with Mark. The people take advantage of a favorable moment—perhaps of that when Jesus had been sent to Herod—to ask for what was always granted them. And on Jesus' return, Pilate tries to give Him the benefit of this circumstance.—The origin of the custom to which this scene refers is unknown. It has been supposed that, since this custom was connected with the Passover feast, it involved an allusion to the deliverance of the Jews from the captivity in Egypt. This is possible. In any case, it is proper to hold that it was something which remained from an

<sup>1</sup> Ⲛ B L X 15 Mnn. omit παντες (all). παλιν (again).

<sup>2</sup> G K U II 50 Mnn. It<sup>l</sup>erique Syr. Cop. omit

ancient prerogative, which the people themselves exercised at the time of their national independence (see *Hase*). The words *ἐν τῷ πάσχα*, at the *Passover*, do not by any means contain, as *Lange*, *Hengstenberg*, etc., allege, the proof that the Paschal supper had been already celebrated. The 14th of Nisan already formed a part of the feast (see on xiii. 1). It is even more probable that the deliverance of the prisoner took place on the 14th than the 15th, in order that he might take part in the Paschal supper with the whole people. In making this proposal to the Jews, Pilate certainly counted on the sympathy of the people for Jesus, as it had manifested itself so strikingly on Palm-day. For Pilate knew perfectly that it was *for envy* that the rulers desired the death of Jesus (*Matt.* xxvii. 18), and that the feeling of a portion of the people was opposite to theirs.—In the designation *king of the Jews* irony prevails, as in ver. 14. Only the sarcasm is not addressed to Jesus, for whom Pilate from the beginning feels a sentiment of increasing respect, but to the Jews. Their king : this, then, is the only rival whom they will ever have to oppose to Cæsar ! But it is said in *Mark* xv. 11, “*the chief priests stirred up the people, that he should release Barabbas unto them.*” The friends of Jesus remained silent, or their feeble voices were drowned by those of the rulers and their creatures. Some resolute agitators imposed their will on the multitude. Thus is the πάντες, *all*, of *John* explained, which answers to the πανπληθεί of *Luke*, and which is no doubt wrongly omitted in the Alexandrian documents. For why should it have been added ?—Until this point in *John’s* narrative the Jews had not uttered any exclamations, and it surprises us to read the words, “*All cried out again.*” But it is otherwise in the narratives of *Mark* (xv. 8 : ἀναβοήσας ὁ ὄχλος) and *Luke* (xxiii. 5, 10 : “*They were urgent saying . . . they vehemently accused him*”). Here also the narrative of *John* fits perfectly into that of his predecessors.—The word ληστής does not always mean *robber*, but sometimes *a violent man* in general. According to *Mark* and *Luke*, Barabbas had taken part in an insurrection in which a murder had been committed. *Westcott* justly observes that in these troublous times acts of violence were frequently committed under the mask of patriotism.—The gravity of the choice made by the people is indicated by one of those brief clauses by which *John* characterizes an especially solemn moment. *Comp.* xi. 35, xiii. 30.—The name of the person who was proposed with Jesus for the choice of the people admits of two etymologies : *Bar-abba*, son of the father, or *Bar-rabban*, son of the Rabbin. In the first case, it should be written with only one *r* ; in the second with two *r*’s. The first mode of writing the word is found in almost all the MSS. ; it is also that of the Talmud, where this name occurs very frequently (*Lightfoot*, p. 489). But the term “son of the father” may mean two very different things ; either : son of the father, God ; or : son of the father, the Rabbin. This second meaning is more applicable to an ordinary name. That this incident should have been occasioned or skilfully taken advantage of by Pilate, to deliver Jesus in this way, was, in any case, so far as concerned him, a denial of justice. For after the declaration of ver. 38, he should have released Him as innocent, and not as a malefactor liberated by way of grace. This first weakness

was soon followed by another more serious one. We come to the third expedient which was tried by Pilate : the scourging of Jesus.

XIX. 1-3. "Then Pilate therefore took Jesus and scourged<sup>1</sup> him ; 2, and the soldiers, having plaited a crown of thorns, placed it upon his head and arrayed him in a purple robe ;<sup>2</sup> and they said, Hail, king of the Jews ! And they struck him with rods."—Pilate had ascended his tribunal to pronounce the liberation of Barabbas. It was at this time that he received the message from his wife (Matt. xxvii. 19). *Hengstenberg* thinks that his washing his hands must also be placed at this time. But this act must have accompanied the pronouncing of the condemnation, which did not take place until later (vv. 13-16). After the two ineffectual efforts which have been described, Pilate has recourse to a third and last expedient. According to the Roman criminal code, scourging must necessarily precede the punishment of crucifixion. This is proved by a multitude of passages from Josephus and the ancient historians.<sup>3</sup> Comp. Matt. xx. 19, Luke xviii. 33, where Jesus, when predicting His Passion, does not separate scourging from crucifixion ; Matt. xxvii. 26 and Mark xv. 15 imply the same thing. But on this occasion a strange thing occurs. Pilate orders the punishment by scourging, without yet pronouncing the decision as to the penalty of crucifixion ; he does not expressly make the first of these two punishments the preliminary step to the second. He evidently hopes, by giving this satisfaction to the enemies of Jesus, to awaken the pity of the more moderate ones among them, as well as the compassion of the multitude and the zeal of His friends, and thus to succeed in averting the extreme punishment. Scourging, as it was practised among the Romans, was a punishment so cruel that the condemned person very often succumbed to it. The scourge was made of rods or thongs armed at the extremity with pieces of bone or lead. The condemned person received the blows while fastened to a small post so as to have 'the back bent and the skin stretched. With the first blows, the back became raw and the blood spurted out. Sometimes death followed immediately.<sup>4</sup>—The maltreatment described in vv. 2, 3 is only the act of the soldiers ; Pilate allows it with the design of turning to account that which takes place.—The crown of thorns, the purple robe, the salutation—this whole masquerade is a parody on Jewish royalty.—The thorny plant is probably the *Lycium spinosum*, which grows abundantly about Jerusalem, and the flexible stalk of which, armed with strong thorns, can be easily plaited. The red mantle was a common soldier's mantle, representing the purple robe worn by kings. This mockery was addressed far less to Jesus personally, whom the soldiers did not know, than to the whole nation, despised and detested by the Romans. It is the Jewish Messianic expectations that the soldiers ridicule in the person of Him who passes for having desired to realize them.

<sup>1</sup> Ν L X Cop. Sah. : λαβων . . . εμαστιγωσε.

<sup>2</sup> Ν B L U X Δ Π 20 Mnn. I<sup>u</sup>pl<sup>u</sup>rique Mg. Cop. Sah. add here και ηρχοντο προς αυτον (and they came to him).

<sup>3</sup> Thus *Justin* says (21, 4) : "The body lacerated by the rods is nailed to the cross."

<sup>4</sup> *Cicero*, in the orations against *Verres*, uses the expressions : "to be scourged to death ;" "thou shalt die by the rods ;" "he was carried away as dead, and died soon afterwards" (see *Keim*).

—This maltreatment and this scourging are evidently the same as those which are spoken of in Matt. xxvii. 27 and Mark xv. 16 ; only these evangelists place them after the condemnation was pronounced, the reason of which fact we shall see. If the accomplishment of the scourging which was ordered by Pilate in these passages of the two Synoptics is not mentioned afterwards in them, it is perhaps because it had already taken place at an earlier moment (John).

Pilate, having allowed things to take their course, pursues his purpose :

Vv. 4-6. “*Pilate went out<sup>1</sup> again and says to them, Behold, I bring him out to you, that you may know that I find no crime in him.<sup>2</sup> 5. Jesus therefore went out, wearing the crown of thorns and the purple robe. And he says to them, Behold<sup>3</sup> the man! 6. When therefore the chief priests and the officers saw him, they cried out:<sup>4</sup> Crucify, crucify<sup>5</sup>! Pilate says to them, Take him yourselves and crucify him; for, as for me, I find no crime in him.*”—The scourging had taken place in the court of the Prætorium (Mark xv. 15, 16), as had also the maltreatment which had followed. As soon as this scene is ended, Pilate goes out with Jesus. This spectacle, as he thought, could not fail to call forth a favorable interference of the people and furnish him the means of resisting the hatred of the priests. A strange way, however, of proving that he finds no fault in Jesus—to inflict on Him such a punishment ! In ver. 4, Pilate means to say : “Well, you must understand ; there is enough of it now. I have consented to this in the way of compliance with your requests ; I will go no farther !” The term *φορεῖν* is more grave than the simple *φέρειν* ; comp. Rom. xiii. 4. In the expression : *Behold the man!* there is a mingling of respect and pity for Jesus and a bitter sarcasm with reference to the absurd part which the Jews impute to Him : “There is the wretched being against whom you are enraged !” But once again Pilate is baffled ; no voice rises from the multitude on behalf of the victim, and he finds himself face to face with the will of the rulers, who persist in pushing matters to extremity, without being satisfied with this half-way punishment. The previous concessions have only emboldened them. Full of indignation and vexation, Pilate then said to them : Take Him yourselves, and crucify Him !—words which, in this context, can only mean : “Do it yourselves, if you will ! I leave you free ; for myself, it is impossible for me to take part in such a murder !” This emotion was noble ; but it was nevertheless fated to remain barren ; for three times already Pilate had abandoned the ground of strict right, on which alone he could have resisted the violent pressure which was exerted upon him.

Of course, the Jews could not think of using the impunity which Pilate offered them. How could they have themselves provided for the execution ? When once the people were delivered from the fear which the Roman power inspired, the rulers clearly perceived that they could not themselves success-

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  D  $\Gamma$  It<sup>al</sup>erique : ἐξῆλθεν simply ; T. R. with 9 Mjj. (E G H etc.) : ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ; 6 Mjj. (A B K etc.) : καὶ ἐξῆλθεν.

<sup>2</sup>  $\aleph$  : οὐκ αἰτίαν οὐχ ευρισκω.

<sup>3</sup>  $\aleph$  B L X Y : ἰδου instead of ἰδε.

<sup>4</sup>  $\aleph$  : ἐκραξαν.

<sup>5</sup> T. R., with B L some Mnn. Vulg<sup>al</sup>erique, omits αὐτον (*him*), which is read by 15 Mjj. It<sup>al</sup>iq Syr. etc.

fully conduct this great affair. By a sudden reaction, the partisans of Jesus might turn violently against them and, drawing on the common mass of the people, might wreck everything. Measuring the dangers of this offer, therefore, they have recourse to a *third* expedient :

Vv. 7-9. “ *The Jews answered him,<sup>1</sup> We have a law, and according to our<sup>2</sup> law, he ought to die ; for he made himself Son of God.* 8. *When therefore Pilate heard this saying, he was the more afraid.* 9. *And he entered into the Prætorium again,<sup>3</sup> and says to Jesus, Whence art thou ? But Jesus gave him no answer.*”—The Romans generally allowed the conquered nations the enjoyment of their laws and their national institutions, exactly as at present the French do with relation to the Mussulmen of Algiers, says *Renan*. The Jews, placing themselves at this point of view, appeal to the article of *their law* (Levit. xxiv. 16), which condemns blasphemers to death, and they imperiously demand of Pilate the application of this article. We may here lay our finger upon the difference, which is so often misapprehended, between the title *Son of God* and that of Messiah, or king of the Jews. The inquiry as to the Messianic or royal claim of Jesus is ended : they pass now to an *entirely new complaint*. And how happened it that the Jews came so late to base the accusation of blasphemy on a title with regard to which there had been a dispute so long from a wholly different point of view ? In vain does *Weiss* try to escape this result by alleging that the question is not of a new complaint, but that the Jews are simply seeking to clear themselves of the matter of asking for the death of an innocent man. The sequel clearly shows that the examination begins altogether anew.—The words of the Jews produced on Pilate an effect which they did not expect. They confirmed a dreadful presentiment which was more and more forming itself within him. He had heard of the miracles of Jesus, of His elevated and mysterious character, of His teachings and His conduct ; he had just received from his wife a strange message ; Jesus Himself was producing on him an impression such as he had never received from any man ; he asks himself if all this is not explained by this title of Son of God ! What if this extraordinary man were really a divine being who had appeared on the earth ? The truth presents itself to his mind naturally under the form of heathen superstitions and mythological recollections. We know, indeed, how sudden is the passing from scepticism to the most superstitious fears. *Reuss* is not willing to admit that this was the ground of the increase of fear which John indicates in Pilate. He explains this fact by the authority of *the law*, which was opposed to his own, and which threw him into an ever-increasing embarrassment. But, in what follows, everything turns upon the dignity of the Son of God. It is this idea which, as we shall see, preoccupies the mind of Pilate, and becomes the subject of his new conversation with Jesus. Here, therefore, is the foundation of his fear. Pilate, having heard the word : Son of God, brings Jesus back to the Prætorium, that he may converse with Him respecting it privately. The question : *Whence art thou ?* cannot refer to the *earthly* origin of Jesus ;

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  I<sup>pericope</sup> omittit αυτω (him).

(our).

<sup>2</sup> 10 Mjj. ( $\aleph$  B etc.) I<sup>pericope</sup> Orig. omittit ημων

<sup>3</sup>  $\aleph$  omittit παλι.

Pilate knows full well that He is from Galilee. The meaning certainly is : "Art thou from the earth or from heaven?" It is in vain, therefore, that *Reuss* claims that it should be applied simply to the *mission*, and not to the *origin* of His person, supporting his view by ix. 29. In the Sanhedrim one might, indeed, propose the question as to the mission of Jesus : whether He was a true or a false prophet. But this distinction had no meaning for a man like Pilate.—We are surprised at the refusal of Jesus to answer. According to some, He kept silence because He feared that, by answering in accordance with the truth, He would keep alive a pagan superstition in the mind of His judge. According to others, He refused to answer a question which is for Pilate a mere matter of curiosity. *Lampe, Luthardt, Keil*, think that He does not wish, through revealing His divine greatness to Pilate, to prevent the plan of God from being carried out even to the end. The true answer appears to me to follow from all that precedes : Pilate knew enough about the matter with regard to Jesus to set Him free ; he had himself declared Him innocent. This should have sufficed for him. What he would know beyond this "did not appertain to his province" (*Ebrard*). If he did not deliver Jesus as an innocent man, he deserved the responsibility of crucifying Him, the Son of God. His crime became His punishment.—Moreover, *Hengstenberg* justly remarks that this silence is an answer. If the claim which the Jews had accused Jesus of making had not been well founded, He could not have failed to deny it.

Vv. 10, 11. "*Pilate says<sup>1</sup> to him : Speakest thou not to me ? Knowest thou not that I have power to release thee and power to crucify thee?*"<sup>2</sup> 11. *Jesus answered,<sup>3</sup> Thou wouldst have<sup>4</sup> no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above ; therefore, he that delivered<sup>5</sup> me unto thee is guilty of a greater sin.*"—Pilate feels that there is a reproach in this silence. He reassumes all his haughtiness as judge and Roman governor. Hence the *ἐμοί, to me*, at the beginning of the clause ("to me, if not to others"), and the repetition of the words, *I have power*.—The T. R. places the *to crucify thee* before the *to release thee*. Undoubtedly the idea of the impending punishment is that which prevails in the conversation ; but the expression becomes still more weighty if it closes with the terrible word *to crucify thee*. Pilate thinks that he has the disposal of Jesus ; he speaks only of his power, without thinking of his dependence and his responsibility. Jesus reminds him that in reality he has not the disposal of anything ; for his power is given him.—The word *given* is opposed to the twofold *I have* of Pilate. The reading *ἔχεις, thou hast*, of *Σ A*, etc., is evidently an error.—This time Jesus speaks ; He also assumes His dignity ; He takes the position of judge of His judge, or rather of all His judges ; and as if He were already Himself seated on His tribunal, He weighs in His infallible scales both Pilate and the Sanhe-

<sup>1</sup> *Σ A* some Mnn. Syr. Cop. omit *οὐν*.

<sup>2</sup> *A B E* Syr. place *ἀπολῦσαι σε (to release thee)* before *σταυρῶσαι σε (to crucify thee)*. T. R. with *D L X* and 10 other Mjj. read in the reverse order.

<sup>3</sup> *Σ B L* It<sup>sup</sup> Syr. add *αὐτῷ*.

<sup>4</sup> *Σ A L X Y Δ Π 10* Mnn. Cop. : *εχεις (thou*

*hast not)* instead of *εχεις (thou wouldst not have)*.

<sup>5</sup> *Σ B E Δ A* It. Vulg. : *παράδους (he who delivered me)*, instead of *παράδους (he who delivers me)* in the T. R. with *A* and 12 other Mjj.

drim. The *διὰ τοῦτο*, *because of this*, refers to the word *given*. "Because this position, in virtue of which thou hast power over me, is given thee—this is the reason why thou art less guilty than the one who delivers me to thee in virtue of a power which he has arrogated to himself." In fact, God, by subjecting His people to the Roman power, had made it subject to the imperial jurisdiction which was at that moment delegated to Pilate. But the Sanhedrim, by taking possession of the person of their King, notwithstanding all the proofs which He had given of His divine mission, and by delivering Him to the pagan authority, arrogated to itself a right which God had not assigned to it, and committed an act of theocratic felony.—*He who delivered me to thee*, therefore, is neither Judas,—Jesus could not, with this meaning, have said : *to thee*,—nor Caiaphas, who only acts in the name of the body which he represents, and who is not named in this whole scene. It is the Sanhedrim, the official representative of the Jewish people, in whose name this body acted.—The explanation of this saying of Jesus which we have just given approaches that of *Calvin*: "He who delivers me to thee is the more guilty of the two, because he makes a *criminal* use of thy *legitimate* power." Some interpreters think that Jesus means to distinguish between the function of judging, which is official, and that of accusing, which is voluntary. But the Jews did not merely accuse, they had judged. The other explanations do not account for *because of this*. Thus the following ones : Pilate is less guilty "because he sins through weakness rather than through wickedness" (*Euthymius*);—"because he has less knowledge than the Jews" (*Grotius*).—Far from being irritated by this answer, Pilate is profoundly impressed by the majesty which breathes in it. Hence the fourth phase of the trial : it is the last effort of Pilate to deliver Jesus, but one which fails before a *fourth* and last expedient held in reserve by the Sanhedrim. As *Hengstenberg* observes, "it is a bad policy to gain the world,—that of beginning by granting it the half of what it asks."

Ver. 12. "*From this time Pilate sought to release him ; but the Jews cried out,*<sup>1</sup> *saying, If thou releasest this man, thou art not Cæsar's friend ; for whoever makes himself a king, opposes Cæsar.*"—Ἐκ τούτου : *from and by reason of* this word uttered by Jesus ; comp. vi. 66.—John seems to say that all the efforts which had been previously made by Pilate with the aim of releasing Jesus had been nothing in comparison with those which he made from now on, under the impression of this last saying which he had just heard. *Weiss* rejects this meaning, and sees in the *he sought* only this idea : he was proposing to end the matter by releasing Him, when the words of the Jews prevented him from doing so. But the imperfect : *he was seeking*, implies a series of efforts and of new attempts with the Jews.—Only the latter had prepared a weapon which they had resolved not to use except in the last extremity ; so ignoble was it in their view both for him who was its object and for those who employed it. It was that of personal intimidation. The reigning emperor, Tiberius, was the most suspicious of despots. The accusation of high treason was always well received by this tyrant. *Qui atroc-*

<sup>1</sup> T. R. with 9 Mj. (E H K etc.): *κραζον*; Mnn.: *κραυγασαν*. N: *ελεγον*.  
A I L M Y H 24 Mnn. Orig.: *κραυγασον*; B 13

*issime exercebat leges majestatis*, says Suetonius. The most unpardonable offence was that of having suffered his authority to be imperilled. Such is the danger which the Jews call up before the dismayed view of Pilate. This equivocal term *King of the Jews*, with the political coloring which it could not fail to have in the eyes of Tiberius, would infallibly make Pilate appear as an unfaithful administrator, who had attempted to screen from punishment an enemy of the imperial authority; and his trial would be a short matter; this Pilate knew well. It is true that the trial of this last expedient was, on the part of the Jews, a renouncing of their great national hope, the very idea of the Messiah, and a making themselves vassals of the empire. Such a victory was a suicide. In this regard also it is easy to understand how, in their plan of battle, they should have reserved this manœuvre for the last; it was the stroke of desperation. The effect of it was immediate:

Vv. 13-16a. "Having therefore heard these words,<sup>1</sup> Pilate brought Jesus out and sat down on the judgment seat, in the place called the Pavement, and in Hebrew, Gabbatha. 14. Now it was the Preparation of the Passover, and<sup>2</sup> about<sup>3</sup> the sixth<sup>4</sup> hour. And he says to the Jews, Behold your King! 15. They cried out,<sup>5</sup> Away with him, away with him, crucify him! Pilate says to him, Shall I crucify your King? The chief priests answered, We have no King but Cæsar. 16a. Then he delivered him to them to be crucified."—The plural τῶν λόγων τούτων, *these words*, in the Alexandrian documents and others, shows that ver. 12 only summarizes the words of the Jews. Before the threat which it implied, the judge, who was already so long renouncing his own proper part, bows his head and submits. Without saying a word more, he brings Jesus forth from the Prætorium; for the sentence must be pronounced in the presence of the accused; and he ascends his tribunal a second time.—The name λιθόστρωτον signifies: *place paved with stones*. Before the Prætorium there was one of the pavements of mosaic on which the Roman magistrates had the custom of placing their judgment-seats. The Aramæan name *Gabbatha* is not the translation of the preceding; it is borrowed from the character of the place. It signifies: *eminence, hill*.

John inserts here the indication of *the day* and *the hour* when the sentence was pronounced. With what purpose? Is it because of the solemnity and importance of this decisive moment for the destiny of mankind? Or does he desire by this means to explain the impatience of the Jews, which manifests itself in ver. 15, to see this long trial come to its close at last and the punishment consummated before the end of this day?—*It was the Preparation of the Passover*, says John. The interpreters who think that the Paschal supper had been celebrated on the preceding evening give to παρασκευή, *preparation*, the technical signification which it sometimes has in the Patristic language, that of *Friday*, this day being the one on which the food for

<sup>1</sup> T. R. reads with K U Δ Π a part of the (T. R. with 4 Mjj.).

Mss. Syr. τούτων τον λογον (*this word*); all <sup>4</sup> Instead of εκτη (*sixth*) L X Δ 3 Mss. read τριτη (*third*).

<sup>2</sup> T. R. reads with Ε Η Ι Σ Υ Γ Α : ωρα δε ;

9 Mjj. (Σ A B etc.) : ωρα ην ; K : ωρα δε ην.

<sup>3</sup> The MSS. are divided between ως and ωσει

<sup>5</sup> Instead of οι δε εκραυγασαν K Y Π : οι δε εκραυγάζον ; B L X : εκραυγασαν ουν εκεινοι ; Σ : οι δε ελεγον.

the Sabbath was prepared : “*the Preparation of the Sabbath.*” Comp. Matt. xxvii. 62, Luke xxiii. 54, and especially Mark xv. 42 : “*the Preparation, which is the day before the Sabbath.*” The complement τοῦ πάσχα, *of the Passover*, must necessarily in this case recall *the Passover week*, to which this Friday belonged. But from the fact that παρασκευή in itself took this technical meaning of *Friday*, it does not follow that, when this word is followed by a complement like τοῦ πάσχα, *of the Passover*, it does not preserve its natural sense of *preparation* : “*the preparation of the Passover.*” This complement has as its precise purpose to distinguish this preparation of the Passover from the simple ordinary preparation for the Sabbath. If the question were only that of indicating the day of the week, why add the complement here : *of the Passover*, which gives the reader absolutely no information, since after xiii. 1, xviii. 28, etc., no one would be ignorant that it was the Passover week at this time. Every Greek reader, when hearing this phrase, would necessarily think of the 14th of Nisan, known as the day on which the Passover supper was prepared. This date agrees with those of xiii. 1, 29, xviii. 28, and leads us, as do all these passages, to the idea that the Passover supper was not yet celebrated, but was to take place on the evening of this day.

According to John, the sentence of Jesus was pronounced *about the sixth hour*—that is, about noon, at least if we do not adopt the method of reckoning according to which John would make the day begin at midnight, in accordance with the custom of the Roman courts. It is certainly difficult to bring this hour of noon into harmony with the account of Matthew, according to which at that hour Jesus had been already for some time suspended on the cross, and still more difficult to reconcile it with Mark xv. 25, where it is said that it was at the *third hour*—that is, at nine o'clock, that Christ *was crucified*. But is the difficulty really any less if, with *Rettig, Tholuck, Wieseler, Keil, Westcott*, etc., we hold that John reckons from midnight, and that the hour indicated is consequently *six o'clock* in the morning? Was not this, according to the Synoptics, the hour when, following upon the session of the morning, the Sanhedrim brought Jesus to Pilate? *Keil* makes the reckoning thus : At five o'clock, the last session of the Sanhedrim until six or half past six ; then the negotiations with Pilate, and the pronouncing of the sentence a little later. But is it possible to confine within so brief a space 1. The first appearance before Pilate ; 2. The sending to Herod ; comp. the words ἐν ἡμέραις ἰκαναῖς (Luke xxiii. 9) ; 3. The discussion relative to the release of Barabbas ; 4. The scourging, with the scene of the *Ecce homo* ; 5. The renewal of the examination after this scene, and finally the pronouncing of the condemnation? No ; the greater part of the morning is not too much for so many things. The reading τρίτη, *third* (nine o'clock), in some MSS. of John, would therefore be in itself very suspicious, even if it were not so evidently a correction intended to reconcile the two narratives. *Eusebius* supposed that some ancient copyist made of the gamma (Γ = 3) a stigma (ς = 6). This supposition in itself has little probability. Let us rather call to mind, the fact that the day as a whole was divided, like the night, into four portions of three hours each. This

fact explains why in the whole New Testament mention is scarcely ever made of any hours except the *third*, *sixth* and *ninth* (comp. Matt. xx. 1-5), and also why, as *Hengstenberg* remarks, the expressions *nearly*, *about*, are so frequent in it (Matt. xxii. 46, Luke xxiii. 44, John iv. 6, Acts x. 3, 9). This word *about* is also added by John in our passage. It is certainly allowable, therefore, to take the middle course, either in Mark or in John, especially if we recall the fact that, as *Lange* says, the apostles did not have watch in hand. As the third hour of Mark, properly nine o'clock, may include all the time from eight to ten, so the sixth hour in John certainly includes from eleven to twelve. The difference, therefore, is no longer so very great. But especially, 2, account must be taken of an important circumstance, noticed by *Lange*: it is that Matthew and Mark, having given to the scourging of Jesus the meaning which it ordinarily had in such a case, made it the *beginning* of the punishment. We see this clearly from the manner in which they both speak of it, connecting it closely with the pronouncing of the condemnation, Matt. xxvii. 26: "*He gave Jesus up to them after having scourged Him.*" Comp. Mark xv. 15. They have therefore united in one the two judicial acts so clearly distinguished by John, that of the *scourging* and that of the final *condemnation*, and they have thus quite naturally dated the second at the same moment as the first. How can *Weiss* call this solution an affirmation without proof? It clearly follows from the comparison of the narratives. *Hofmann* has proposed the following solution: a mark of punctuation must be placed after the word *παρασκευή*, and we must translate: "It was Friday, and the sixth hour of the Passover" (omitting the *δέ* after *ώρα* with the principal Mjj.).—But the hours of the *day*; not those of the *feast*, are reckoned.

There is a bitter irony in the words of Pilate: *Behold your King!* But it is directed towards the Jews, not towards Jesus. Towards the latter, Pilate constantly shows himself full of a respectful interest, which, near the end, amounts even to fear. In this sarcasm there is at the same time a serious side. Pilate understands that, if there is a man through whom the Jewish people are to fulfil a mission in the world, it is this man.—The rage of the rulers increases on hearing this declaration. The three arist imperatives express the impatience and haste to have the matter ended. Pilate henceforth consents to yield; but first he wishes to give himself the pleasure of yet once more striking the dagger into the wound: *Shall I crucify your king?* He avenges himself thus for the act of baseness to which they compel him. The Jews are driven thereby to the memorable declaration by which they themselves pronounced the abolition of the theocracy and the absorption of Israel into the world of the Gentiles. They who cherished only one thought—the overthrow of the throne of the Cæsars by the Messiah—suffer themselves to be carried away by hatred of Jesus so far as to cry out before the representative of the emperor: "*We have no other king but Cæsar.*" "*Jesum negant,*" says *Bengel*, "*usque eo ut omnino Christum negent.*"

After this, all is said. By denying the expectation of the Messiah, Israel has just denied itself; at such a price does it secure the end that Jesus

should be surrendered to it. *Ἀυτοῖς*, *to them*, says John, and not to the Roman executioners. For the latter will be only the blind instruments of the judicial murder which is about to be committed.

Modern criticism (*Baur, Strauss, Keim*) regards this entire representation of Pilate's conduct as fictitious. The thought of the author is to personify in Pilate the sympathy of the pagan world for the Gospel, and to throw upon Israel almost the whole responsibility of the crime. But 1. The fact is not presented otherwise in the Synoptics, in the Acts and in the Epistles. In Matthew, *the governor marvelled* (ver. 14); he knows that it is *for envy* that the rulers deliver Jesus to him (ver. 18); he endeavors by means of the people to effect His release, rather than that of Barabbas (vv. 17, 22). He asks indignantly: "*What evil, then, has he done?*" (ver. 23). He sees *that he prevails nothing*, and ends by yielding, while he declares himself, by a solemn act, *innocent of the blood of this righteous man* (ver. 24). Such is the description of the condemnation of Jesus by Pilate in the Gospel which is called Jewish-Christian. Does it really differ from John's description? Mark brings out still more clearly than Matthew the eagerness with which Pilate takes advantage of the spontaneous request of the multitude that a prisoner should be released to them, and the support which he counts upon finding in the popular sympathy for the saving of Jesus (vv. 8-10). Luke adds to the other attempts of Pilate that of the sending of Jesus to Herod, and the twice repeated proposal to release Him at the cost of a simple scourging (vv. 16, 22). "*Having the desire to release Jesus*" is expressly said in ver. 20. Then in ver. 22: "*And he said to them the third time, Why, what evil has he done?*" In the Acts, the conciliatory tendency of which book towards Judaism is made prominent at the present time, Peter, as well as John, charges the Jews with the whole responsibility for the murder: "*You have crucified him by the hands of wicked men,*" ii. 23; comp. iii. 15. Even James, when addressing the rich men of his nation, says to them: "*You have condemned and put to death the Righteous One*" (v. 6). Finally, the Apocalypse—that book which is represented as the most pronounced manifestation of Jewish-Christianity—designates Jerusalem as "*the Sodom and spiritual Egypt where our Lord was crucified,*" xi. 8. The notion of place (*where*) in this passage very evidently includes those of causality and responsibility.—2. Moreover, the second century, in which it is claimed that the composition of the Fourth Gospel must be placed, was, from Trajan to Marcus Aurelius, a time of bloody persecution on the part of the pagan world against the Church, and it would be very strange that at that epoch an author should have attributed to the Roman governor an imaginary character with the purpose of personifying in him *the sympathy* of the pagan world for the Gospel!—3. Finally, the scene described by John is its own defence. It is impossible to portray more to the life, the astuteness, the perseverance and the impudent suppleness of the accuser, determined to succeed, at any cost, on the one side, and, on the other, the obstinate struggle, in the heart of the judge, between the consciousness of his duty and the care for his own interests, between the fear of sacrificing an innocent man, perhaps more formidable than He appeared to be outwardly, and that of driving to extremity a people already exasperated by crying acts of injustice, and of finding himself accused before a suspicious emperor, *one stroke of whose pen (Reuss)* might precipitate him into destruction; finally, between cold scepticism and the transient impressions of natural religiousness and

even pagan superstition. *Reuss* acknowledges that it is "the Fourth Gospel which gives the true key of the problem" of Pilate's inconceivable conduct: "Jesus was sacrificed by him to an exigency of his position" (p. 675). Excepting the natural vacancies resulting from "the fact that no witness saw the whole from one end to the other," the Gospel narrative (that of John included) "bears, according to this author, the seal of entire authenticity" (*ibid.*). These two figures, in fact—one of a cold and diabolical perversity (Caiaphas, as the representative of the Sanhedrim), the other of a cowardice and pitiable vacillation—both contrasting with the calm dignity and holy majesty of the Christ, form a picture which we do not hesitate to call the masterpiece of the Gospel of John, and which, by itself alone, might, if necessary, serve as a certification of authenticity for this entire work.—Whence did he derive such complete information? Perhaps he saw everything himself. The judicial sessions among the Romans were public, and he was not prevented from entering the court of the Prætorium by the same scruples as the Jews. For he did not have to eat the Passover supper in the evening.

### THIRD SECTION.

#### XIX. 16b-42.

#### THE EXECUTION OF JESUS.

1. The crucifixion : vv. 16b-18 ; 2. The inscription : vv. 19-22 ; 3. The parting of the garments : vv. 23, 24 ; 4. The filial legacy : vv. 25-27 ; 5. The death : vv. 28-30 ; 6. The breaking of the legs and the spear-thrust : vv. 31-37 ; 7. The burial : vv. 38-42.

John does not desire to present a complete picture of the crucifixion of Jesus. He brings out some circumstances omitted by his predecessors, and at the same time completes and gives precision to their narratives.

The crucifixion :

Vv. 16b-18. "Now<sup>1</sup> they took Jesus ;<sup>2</sup> and, bearing his cross,<sup>3</sup> he went out of the city [going] to the place called the place of the skull, in Hebrew Golgotha, 18, where they crucified him, and with him two others, on either side one, and Jesus in the midst."—These two verses sum up very briefly the Synoptic narrative. The subject of *they took* is : the Jews (ver. 16a) ; it was they who executed the sentence by the hands of the soldiers. It would be otherwise if the following words : *and they led Him away*, in the T. R., were authentic. For the subject would then be : the soldiers.—According to ancient testimonies, condemned persons were obliged to bear their own cross, at least the horizontal piece of wood. This is implied, moreover, in the figurative expression used by Jesus in the Synoptics : "If any man will come after me, . . . let him take up his cross" (Matt. xvi. 24 and parallels). John alone mentions this particular in the sufferings of Jesus. And in this he does not

<sup>1</sup> The MSS. are, divided between δε (T. R. with 14 Mjj.) and ουν (B L X).

<sup>2</sup> After τον Ιησουν, T. R. reads with A M U F : και απηγαγον (and led him away) ; 9 Mjj 130 Mun. : και ηγαγον ; B L X some Mun. 1[61-71]

Cop. reject these words ; Ν : οι δε λαβοντες τον Ι. απηγαγον αυτου.

<sup>3</sup> T. R. with 11 Mjj. : αυτου (εαυτου) ; B X : αυτω ; Ν L II : εαυτω.

contradict the Synoptics, who relate that Simon of Cyrene was compelled to perform this office. For the participle βασιάζων, *bearing*, is closely connected with the verb ἐξῆλθεν, *he went forth bearing*. At the moment of setting out, Jesus was subjected to the common rule. Afterwards it was feared, no doubt, that He might succumb, and advantage was taken of the meeting with Simon to free Him from the burden.—Moses had prohibited capital executions in the enclosure of the camp (Levit. xxiv. 14, Num. xv. 35), and the people remained faithful to the spirit of this law, by putting criminals to death outside of the walls of cities (1 Kings xxi. 13, Acts vii. 58). It is on this custom that the exhortation in Heb. xiii. 12, 13 is founded. Ἐξῆλθεν accordingly means: *He went forth from the city*. The Holy Sepulchre is now quite a distance within the interior of Jerusalem; but the city wall may have been displaced. The bare rock in this place seems to prove, even now, that this part of the city was formerly not inhabited. Moreover, there exists no certain tradition respecting the place of the crucifixion and that of the burial of Jesus.—The name *place of the skull* does not come from the executions which took place on this spot; the plural would then be necessary: *place of skulls*; and among the Jews such remains would not have been left uncovered. The origin of the name was undoubtedly the rounded form and the bare aspect of the hill. *Golgotha*: גִּלְגֹּתַיִת, in Aramaic גִּלְגֹּתַיִת, *skull*, from גָּלַגַּל, *to roll*. The word ἑβραϊστί, which is found four times in our Gospel, is found again twice in the Apocalypse, but nowhere else in the whole New Testament.

The cross had the form of a T. It was not very high (see ver. 29). Sometimes it was laid on the ground, the condemned person was nailed to it, then it was raised up. But most frequently it was made firm in the ground; the condemned person was raised to the proper height by means of cords (*in cruce[m] tollere*); then the hands were nailed to the transverse piece of wood. That they might not be torn by the weight of the body, the latter rested on a block of wood fastened to the shaft of the cross, on which the condemned sat as on horseback. There has been a long discussion, in modern times, on the question whether the feet were also nailed. The passages from ancient writers cited by *Meyer* (see on Matt. xxvii. 35) and *Keim* are decisive; they prove that, as a rule, the feet were nailed. Luke xxiv. 39 leads us to think that this was the case with Jesus. The condemned commonly lived on the cross twelve hours, sometimes even to the third day.

This kind of death united in the highest degree the pains and infamy of all other punishments. *Cruelissimum terribimumque supplicium*, says Cicero (*in Verrem*). The increasing inflammation of the wounds, the unnatural position, the forced immobility and the rigidity of the limbs which resulted from it, the local congestions, especially in the head, the inexpressible anguish resulting from the disturbance of the circulation, a burning fever and thirst tortured the condemned without killing him.—Was it the Jews who had demanded the execution of the other two condemned persons, in order to render the shame of Jesus more complete? Or must we find here an insult on Pilate's part to the Jewish people represented by these two companions in punishment of their King? It is difficult to say.

The inscription :

Vv. 19-22. "*Pilate also caused an inscription to be made and to be put*<sup>1</sup> *upon the cross ; there was written : Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews.* 20. *Many of the Jews therefore read this inscription, because the place where Jesus was crucified was near the city ; and it was written in Hebrew, in Greek, and in Latin.*" 21. *The chief priests of the Jews said therefore to Pilate : Write not, The King of the Jews,*<sup>2</sup> *but that he said, I am King of the Jews.* 22. *Pilate answered, What I have written, I have written.*"—John here completes the very brief account of the Synoptics. According to the Roman custom, the *cruciarivus* carried himself, or there was carried before him, on the road to the crucifixion, an inscription (*titulus*, τίτλος, ἐπιγραφή, στίλις, αἰτία) which contained the indication of his crime, and which was afterwards fastened to the cross. Pilate took advantage of this custom to stigmatize the Jews by proclaiming even for the last time this malefactor to be their King.—*Tholuck* and *de Wette* have thought that ἐγράφη must be explained in the sense of *had written* ; *Meyer* and *Weiss* hold that Pilate had the inscription written during the crucifixion, and placed on the cross after it. But the δὲ καί, *now also*, is a connection sufficiently loose to allow us to place these acts at the very time of the crucifixion, which is more natural. The mention of the three languages in which this inscription was written is found also in Luke, according to the ordinary reading ; but this reading is uncertain. Hebrew was the national language, Greek the language universally understood, and Latin that of the conquering nation. Pilate wished thus to give the inscription the greatest publicity possible. Jesus, therefore, at the lowest point of His humiliation, was proclaimed Messiah-King in the languages of the three principal peoples of the world.—The expression : *the chief priests of the Jews*, ver. 21, is remarkable. It is found nowhere else. *Hengstenberg* explains it by an intentional contrast with the term *King of the Jews*. The struggle, indeed, was between these two theocratic powers. This explanation, however, is far-fetched ; the expression means, more simply, that they were acting here as defenders of the cause of the theocratic people.—The imperfect *they said* characterizes the attempt which fails. The present *write not* is the present of the idea. Pilate answers with the twice repeated perfect : *I have written* ; it is the tense of the accomplished fact. We find Pilate here again as Philo describes him : *inflexible in character* (*Hengstenberg*).

The parting of the garments :

Vv. 23, 24. "*The soldiers therefore, when they had crucified*<sup>4</sup> *Jesus, took his garments and made four parts, one for every soldier, and then the tunic ;*<sup>5</sup> *now the tunic was without seam, woven from the top throughout.* 24. *They said therefore one to another :*<sup>6</sup> *Let us not rend it, but let us cast lots for it whose it shall be. That the Scripture might be fulfilled which says :*<sup>7</sup> *They parted my*

<sup>1</sup> A K 12 Mm. : ἐπεθηκεν ἵνα ἐθηκεν.

<sup>2</sup> Instead of εβρ., ελλην., ρωμ., B L X 8 Mm. Cop. Sah. read εβρ., ρωμ., ελλην.

<sup>3</sup> X omits vv. 20 and 21 as far as ἀλλ' ὅτι not included.

<sup>4</sup> Instead of ὅτε ἐσταυρωσαν, X ἡναι σε σταυρω-

σαντες.

<sup>5</sup> X It<sup>al</sup>iq Syr<sup>sch</sup> omit the words και τον χιτωνα (and the tunic).

<sup>6</sup> X : αυτους instead of αλληλους.

<sup>7</sup> X B It<sup>er</sup>ique omit η λεγουσα (which says).

garments among them, and upon my vesture they cast lots. These things therefore the soldiers did."—Here, also, John completes his predecessors, so far as the description of the tunic and the accomplishment of the prophecy are concerned. The Roman law *De bonis damnatorum* adjudged to the executioners the garments of the condemned. It is generally held that the entire detachment was composed of four men.<sup>1</sup> Keim thinks that each cross had its particular detachment.<sup>2</sup> The soldiers performed two operations. They divided among themselves either the different pieces of clothing, such as the caps, girdles, under-garments, sandals and tunics of the two malefactors, or the garments of Jesus alone (*αὐτοῦ, of him, ver. 23*), if the question is only of the particular detachment which had to do with Him. Then, as the tunic of Jesus could not be divided, and was too precious to be placed in one of the parts, they cast lots for it. This tunic was undoubtedly a gift of the women who ministered to Jesus (Luke viii. 2, 3, Matt. xxvii. 55). It was woven throughout its whole length, as, according to Josephus, the garment of the priests was. Hence the use of the lot (*therefore, ver. 24*). Thus was realized to the very letter the description of the Psalmist, as he drew the picture of the King of Israel at the height of His sufferings. Criticism claims, it is true, that the two members of the verse quoted by the evangelist (Ps. xxii. 19) are entirely synonymous, and that John is the sport of his own imagination in wishing to distinguish either between the verbs *to divide* and *to cast lots*, or between the substantives *ἱμάτια, garments*, and *ἱματισμός, robe* (LXX). But a more profound study of the parallelism in Hebrew poetry shows that the second member always adds a shade or a new idea to the idea of the first. Otherwise the second would be merely an idle tautology. It is not repetition, but progression. Thus, in this verse, the gradation from the plural *בגדי, garments*, to the singular *לבוש, tunic*, is manifest. The first term designates the different pieces making up the outer clothing and the second the vestment, properly so called, after the removal of which one is entirely naked, the tunic. The passage in Job xxiv. 7-10 confirms this natural distinction. The advance from one verb to the other is no less perceptible. It is already a great humiliation to the condemned person to see his garments *divided*. After this he must say to himself that there is nothing left for him except to die. But what greater humiliation than to see lots drawn for his garments, and thus see them treated like a worthless plaything! David meant to describe the two degrees, and John calls to the reader's notice the fact that in the crucifixion of Jesus they are, both of them, literally reproduced; not that the fulfilment of the prophecy was dependent on this detail, but it appeared more distinctly by reason of this coincidence; and this the more because everything was carried out by the instrumentality of rude and blind agents, the Roman soldiers; comp. the remarks on xii. 15, 16.—It is on this last idea that John wishes to lay stress when he concludes the narrative of this scene with the words: *These things therefore the soldiers did*. The Roman governor had proclaimed Jesus *the King of the Jews*; the Roman soldiers,

<sup>1</sup> Philo, *in Flaccum*.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Acts xii. 4, where we find four de-

tachments, each of four men; undoubtedly one for each of the four watches.

without meaning it, pointed Him out as the true David promised in Psalm xxii.

*Strauss* thinks (new *Vie de Jésus*, p. 569 ff.) that, when the Messianic pretensions of Jesus had been proved false by the cross, the Church sought in the Old Testament the idea of the suffering Messiah, and found it there, especially in Ps. xxii. and lxix. Thenceforward there was imagined in this programme a whole fictitious picture of the Passion. Thus the facts, in the first place, created the exegesis; then the exegesis created the facts. But 1. The idea of the suffering Messiah existed in Jewish theology before and independently of the cross (Vol. I., pp. 311 f. 324). 2. It will always be difficult to prove that *some* righteous person, *whoever* he may have been, under the Old Covenant could have hoped, as the author of Ps. xxii. does, that the effect of his deliverance would be the conversion of the Gentile nations and the establishment of the kingdom of God even to the ends of the earth (vv. 26-32).

The filial legacy :

Vv. 25-27. "Now there stood near the cross of Jesus his mother and his mother's sister, Mary<sup>1</sup> the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene. 26. Jesus, therefore, seeing his mother and beside her the disciple whom he loved, says to his mother,<sup>2</sup> Woman, behold thy son. 27. Then he says to the disciple, Behold thy mother. And from that hour<sup>3</sup> that disciple took her to his home."—This incident has been preserved for us by John alone. Matthew and Mark say, indeed, that a certain number of Galilean women were present, but "beholding from afar." It follows from John's narrative either that some of them, particularly the mother of Jesus, were standing nearer the cross—this detail may easily have been omitted in the Synoptic tradition—or that, at the moment of Jesus' death, they had withdrawn out of the way, in order to observe what was about to take place; for it is then only that the presence of these women is mentioned in the Synoptics.—*Παρά* does not mean *at the foot*, but *beside*; the cross was not very high (ver. 29).—We have already stated, in the *Introduction* (Vol. I., pp. 29, 30), that *Wieseler*, holding to the reading of the *Peshito* (see critical note 1), finds in this verse the mention, not of three women, but of four. He thus escapes the difficulty that two sisters should bear the same name, Mary—the mother of Jesus and the wife of Clopas. The sister of Mary, the mother of Jesus, according to him, is not named; and she is consequently no other than Salome, the mother of John, indicated by Matt. xxvii. 56 and Mark xv. 40 as also present at the crucifixion. *Wieseler's* opinion has been adopted by *Meyer*, *Luthardt*, *Weiss*, *Westcott*, etc. The incident here related becomes, it is said, much more intelligible; for if the mother of the apostle John was the sister of Mary, and this apostle the first cousin of Jesus, we can explain more easily how Jesus could entrust His mother to him, notwithstanding the presence of her sons. This interpretation seems to me inadmissible. By omitting a *καί*, and, before the words: *Mary, the wife of Clopas* (at least, if the text of *all* our

<sup>1</sup> Syrac<sup>b</sup> and the Persian and Ethiopian Vss. read *καί* before *Μαρια η τ, K.* (*and* Mary, the wife of Clopas).

<sup>2</sup>  $\Sigma$  B L X I<sup>al</sup> omit *αυτου*.

<sup>3</sup> A E 40 Mun. Sah. : *ημερας* (*day*) instead of *ωρας*.

MSS. without exception is correct), the evangelist would have expressed himself in a quite equivocal way. And if this so close relationship between Jesus and the sons of Zebedee had existed, how should there not have been the slightest trace of it in the entire Gospel history? Is it not more simple to hold that John abstained from mentioning his mother, as he does in the rest of the Gospel? Undoubtedly it is scarcely possible that two sisters should bear the same name. But the Greek term *γαλιώτης*, which means *sister-in-law*, was so little used that John might prefer to avail himself of the simpler term *ἀδελφή* (*sister*) to express this idea. These words of Jesus, thus understood, contain nothing unkindly either to His own brothers, who did not even yet believe on Him, or to the mother of John himself, who was by no means separated thereby from her son. Hegesippus declares positively that Joseph's brother, whom he also calls the uncle of Jesus (or of James), was named Clopas (Vol. I., p. 358 f.). This name must in this case be regarded as the Greek form of the Aramaic *כלפא*, *Alpheus*. *Reuss* sees herein "one of the grossest mistakes of modern exegesis," and thinks that Clopas is a Jewish corruption of the Greek name *Kleopatros*. But in speaking thus *Reuss* himself confounds Clopas with *Cleopas*, a name which is also known in the New Testament (Luke xxiv. 18).—Respecting Mary, the wife of Clopas, see Vol. I., p. 358 f.—The Synoptics do not mention the presence of Jesus' mother, perhaps because she left the cross immediately after the fact reported by John, and because they do not speak of the presence of the friends of Jesus and of the women except at the end of the whole story.

Stripped of everything, Jesus seemed to have nothing more to give. Nevertheless, from the midst of this deep poverty, He had already made precious gifts; to His executioners He had bequeathed the pardon of God, to His companion in punishment, Paradise. Could He find nothing to leave to His mother and His friend? These two beloved persons, who had been His most precious treasures on earth, He bequeathed to one another, giving thus at once a son to His mother, and a mother to His friend. This word full of tenderness must have completely broken Mary's heart. Not being able to endure this sight, she undoubtedly at this moment left the sorrowful spot.—The word *to his home* does not imply that John possessed a house in Jerusalem, but simply that he had a lodging there; comp. the same *εἰς τὰ ἴδια* applied to all the apostles, xvi. 32. From this time, Mary lived with Salome and John, first at Jerusalem and then in Galilee (*Introduction*, Vol. I., p. 35). According to the historian Nicephorus Kallistus (died in 1350), she lived eleven years with John at Jerusalem, and died there at the age of fifty-nine. Her tomb is shown in a grotto a few paces from the garden of Gethsemane. According to others, she accompanied John to Asia Minor and died at Ephesus.—On the word: *Woman*, which has nothing but respect in it, see on ii. 4.

*Keim*, after the example of *Baur*, regards this incident as an invention of pseudo-John, intended to exalt the apostle whose name he assumes, and to make him the head of the Church, superior even to James and Peter. *Renan* attributes this same fiction to the school of John, which yielded to the desire

of making its patron the vicar of Christ. For every one who has the sense of truth, this scene and these words do not admit of an explanation of this kind. Besides, is it not Peter whom our evangelist presents as the great and bold confessor of Jesus (vi. 68, 69)? Is it not to the same apostle that the direction of the Church is ascribed in ch. xxi. and this by a grand thrice repeated promise (vv. 15-17)? Finally, this supposition would imply that the mother of Jesus is here the type of the Church, a thing of which there is no trace either in this text or in the whole Gospel.

The death :

Vv. 28-30. "After this, Jesus, knowing<sup>1</sup> that all was now finished, that the Scripture might be fulfilled,<sup>2</sup> says, I thirst. 29. There was<sup>3</sup> a vessel there full of vinegar; and the soldier's, having filled a sponge with vinegar and having put it on the end of a hyssop stalk,<sup>4</sup> brought it to his mouth. 30. When Jesus therefore had taken the vinegar, he said, It is finished. Then, having bowed his head, he gave up his spirit."—John completes by means of some important details the narrative already known respecting the last moments of Jesus.—*Μετὰ τοῦτο*, after this, must be taken in a broad sense, as throughout our whole Gospel. It is between the preceding incident and this one that the unspeakable anguish of heart is to be placed from the depth of which Jesus cried out: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"—The expression: *All is finished*, refers to His task as Redeemer, so far as He was able to accomplish it during His earthly existence, and, at the same time, to the prophetic picture in which this task had been traced beforehand. There remained, however, a point in the prophecy which was not yet accomplished. Many interpreters (*Bengel, Tholuck, Meyer, Luthardt, Baumlein, Keil*) make *ὅτι*, that, depend on *τετέλεισται*: "Knowing that all was accomplished to this end, that the Scripture might be fulfilled." This sense does not seem to me admissible. The fulfilment of the Scriptures cannot be regarded as the *end* of the accomplishment of the work of Jesus. Moreover, it follows precisely from vv. 28, 29 that, if the redemptive work was consummated, there was, nevertheless, a point still wanting to the fulfilment of the prophetic representation of the sufferings of the Messiah, and that Jesus does not wish to leave this point unfulfilled. The *that* depends therefore on the following verb *λέγει*: *Jesus says*. So *Chrysostom, Lücke, de Wette, Weiss*, etc. Only we must not, with *Weiss*, attribute the purpose to God; it is that of Jesus Himself, as the *εἰδώς*, *knowing that*, shows. By saying *I thirst*, Jesus really meant to occasion the literal fulfilment of this last point of the sufferings of the Messiah: "They gave me vinegar to drink" (Ps. lxxix. 22). Jesus had been for a long time tormented by thirst—it was one of the most cruel tortures of this punishment—and He could have restrain-

<sup>1</sup> E G H K S Y Γ 70 Mnn. Cop.: *ἰδων* (*seeing*), instead of *εἰδως*.

<sup>2</sup> Instead of *τετέλειωθη*, *ἔτελειωθη* some Mnn.: *πληρωθη*.

<sup>3</sup> A B L X It<sup>all</sup>q omit the *οὖν* (*therefore*), which T. R. reads with the other Mjj., with the exception of *ἔ*, which reads *δε* (*now*).

<sup>4</sup> *ἔ* B L X some Mnn. It<sup>all</sup>q Sah. read *σπογγον οὖν μεστον οξους υσσωπω περιθεντες* (*having put on a hyssop stalk a sponge full of vinegar*), instead of *οι δε πλησαντες σπογγον οξους και υσσωπω περιθεντες* which T. R. reads with 13 Mjj. Syr. (*they having filled a sponge with vinegar and having put it on a hyssop stalk*).

ed even to the end, as He had done up to this moment, the expression of this painful sensation. If He did not do it, it was because He knew that this last point must still be fulfilled, and because He desired that it should be fulfilled without delay. John says *πελειωθῆ*, and not *πληρωθῆ* (which is wrongly substituted by some documents). The question, indeed, is not of the *fulfilment* of this special prophecy, but of the *completing* of the fulfilment of the Scripture prophecies *in general*. *Keil* thinks that this momentary refreshment was necessary for Him, in order that He might be able Himself to give up His soul to God.—The drink offered to Jesus is not the stupefying potion which He had refused at the moment of the crucifixion, and which was a deadening wine mixed with myrrh (Mark) or wormwood (Matthew). Jesus had refused it, because He wished to preserve the perfect clearness of His mind until the end. The potion which the soldier offers Him now is no longer the soldiers' wine, as it was ordinarily called; for, in that case, the sponge and the stalk of hyssop would have been to no purpose. It was vinegar prepared for the *condemned* themselves.—In the first two Gospels, the cry of Jesus: “Eli, Eli! . . . My God! my God! . . .” had called forth from a soldier a similar act, but three hours had elapsed since then.—Hyssop is a plant which is only a foot and a half high. Since a stalk of this length was sufficient to reach the lips of the condemned person, it follows from this that the cross was not so high as it is ordinarily represented.—*Ostervald* and *Martin* translate altogether wrongly: “They put hyssop *around* [the sponge];” or “*surrounding* it with hyssop.” A Dutch critic, *de Koe* (*Conjecturaal Critiek en het Evangelie naar Johannes*, 1883), has proposed to substitute for *ἵσσοπῶ* (*hyssop*) *ἵσσοφ*, a lance. The conjecture is ingenious, but not sufficiently well founded.

“*I thirst*” was the fifth expression of the Saviour, and “*all is finished*” the sixth. The first three of His seven expressions on the cross had reference to His personal relations: they were the prayer for His executioners (Luke), the promise made to the thief, His companion in punishment (Luke), the legacy made to His mother and His friend (John). The following three referred to His work of salvation: the cry “My God . . .” (Matthew and Mark), to the moral sufferings of the expiatory sacrifice; the groan: “*I thirst*” (John), to His physical sufferings; the triumphant expression: “*It is finished*,” to the consummation of both. Finally, the seventh and last, which is expressly mentioned only by Luke: “*Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit*,” is implied in John in the word *παρέδωκε*, *he gave up*; it refers to Himself, to the finishing of His earthly existence. This Greek term is not exactly rendered by our phrase *to give up the ghost*. It expresses a spontaneous act. “*No one takes my life*,” Jesus had said; “*I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again*” (x. 18); it would be necessary to translate by the word *hand over* (commit). Such was also the meaning of the *loud cry* with which, according to Matthew and Mark, Jesus expired.—The word *κλίνας*, “*having bowed His head*,” indicates that until then He had held His head erect.

The breaking of the legs: vv. 31-37.

Ver. 31. “*The Jews therefore, that the bodies might not remain on the cross*

during the Sabbath, because it was the preparation<sup>1</sup> (for the day of that Sabbath<sup>2</sup> was a high day), asked Pilate that the legs of the crucified might be broken, and that they might be taken away."—John describes here a series of Providential facts, omitted by his predecessors, which occurred in quick succession, and which united in impressing on the person of Jesus, in His condition of deepest humiliation, the Messianic seal. The Romans commonly left the bodies of the condemned on the cross; they became the prey of wild beasts or of dissolution. But the Jewish law required that the bodies of executed criminals should be put out of the way before sunset, that the Holy Land might not, on the following day, be polluted by the curse attached to the lifeless body, a monument of a divine condemnation (Deut. xxi. 23, Josh. viii. 29, x. 26, Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* iv. 5, 2). Ordinarily, no doubt, the Romans did not trouble themselves about this law. But, in this particular case, the Jews would have been absolutely unable to bear the violation of it, because, as John observes, the following day was neither an ordinary day nor even an ordinary Sabbath; it was a Sabbath of an altogether exceptional solemnity. Those who think that, according to John himself, the Jewish people had already celebrated the Passover on the preceding evening, and that at this time the great Sabbatic day of the 15th Nisan was ending, give to the word *παρασκευή*, *preparation*, the technical sense of *Friday*, and explain the special solemnity of the Saturday which was to follow by the fact that this Sabbath belonged to the *Passover* week. They call to mind also the fact that on the 16th of Nisan the offering of the sacred sheaf was celebrated, a well-known act of worship by which the harvest was annually opened. But neither the one nor the other of these reasons can explain the extraordinary solemnity which John ascribes to the Sabbath of the next day. The 16th of Nisan was in itself so little of a Sabbath that, in order to cut the ears on the evening of the 15–16th, which were intended to form the sacred sheaf, the messengers of the Sanhedrim were obliged to wait until the people cried out to them: "The sun is set;" then only did the 16th begin, and then only could they take the sickle. Thus in Levit. xxiii. 11–14 the 16th is called "the day after the Sabbath." How could the weekly Sabbath derive its superior sanctity from its coincidence with this purely working day? As to the technical sense of *Friday*, given to *παρασκευή*, it is set aside here by the absence of the article. Finally, the *γάρ*, *for*, clearly puts the idea of *preparation* in a logical relation to that of the extraordinary sanctity of the Sabbath which was to begin at six o'clock in the evening, and thus obliges us to keep for this word its natural sense of *preparation*. Hence it follows that the time of Jesus' death was the afternoon of the 14th, and not that of the 15th, since the Sabbatic day was on the point of beginning, not of ending. The words: "*For it was the preparation*," signify at once preparation for the Sabbath (as Friday) and

<sup>1</sup> The words *επει παρασκευη ην* (because it was the preparation), are placed by *Σ Β Λ Χ V* 10 Mm. It<sup>perique</sup> Vulg: Syr. Cop. Sah. immediately after *οι ουν Ιουδαιοι* (the Jews therefore), and not after *εν τω σαββατω* (T. R. with 12

Mj.).

<sup>2</sup> Instead of *εκευη* which T. R. reads with some Mm. It<sup>aliqua</sup> Vulg. (that day of the Sabbath), *εκεινου* is read in all the other documents (the day of that Sabbath).

preparation for the great Paschal day (as the day before the 15th of Nisan). There was, therefore, on this day a double preparation, because there was an accumulation of Sabbath rest on the following day, which was at once the weekly Sabbath and the great Sabbath, the first day of the feast. By the words : "it was the preparation," the evangelist reminds us indirectly that the essential act of the preparation, the slaying of the lamb, took place in the temple at that very moment, and that the Paschal supper was about to follow in a few hours. This was the reason why it was a matter of absolute necessity, from the Jewish point of view, that the bodies should be put out of the way without delay, before the following day should begin (at six o'clock in the evening).—Pilate, respecting this scruple, consented to the thing which was asked of him. The breaking of the legs did not occasion death immediately, but it was intended to make it certain, and thus to allow of the removal of the bodies. For it rendered any return to life impossible, because mortification necessarily and immediately resulted from it. The existence of this custom (*σκελοκοπία, crurifragium*), among the Romans, in certain exceptional cases, is fully established (see the numerous passages cited by *Keim*). Thus *Renan* says : "The Jewish archæology and the Roman archæology of ver. 31 are exact." If *Keim* himself has, notwithstanding this, raised difficulties, asking why the Synoptics do not mention this fact if it is historical, it is easy to answer him : Because Jesus Himself was not affected by it. But His person alone was of importance to them, not those of the two malefactors. Neither would John have mentioned this detail except for its relation to the fulfilment of a prophecy, which had so forcibly struck him.—Is it necessary to understand ἀρθῶσι, *might be taken away*, simply of removal *from the cross*. I think not. What concerned the Jews who made the request was not that the bodies should be unfastened, but that they should be put out of sight. The law Deut. xxi. 23, which required of them this request, had no reference to the punishment of the cross, which was unknown to Israel.

Vv. 32-34. "*The soldiers therefore came and broke the legs of the first, then of the other who was crucified with him. 33. But, when they came to Jesus, seeing that he was already dead,<sup>1</sup> they did not break his legs ; 34, but one of the soldiers pierced his side with his spear, and immediately there came thereout blood and water.*"—The word : *they came*, is more naturally explained if we hold with *Storr, Olshausen* and *Weiss* that they were different soldiers from those who had accomplished the work of crucifixion. They had been sent especially for this purpose with the necessary instruments.—If the purpose for which the limbs of the condemned were broken was that of which we have spoken, this treatment was made useless with respect to Jesus by the fact of His death. The spear-thrust of the soldier was, therefore, as it were, only a compensation for the operation which was omitted ; it signified: If thou art not dead already, here is what will finish thee. It would be absurd to demand examples for such an act, which had in it nothing judicial.—The verb *νύσσειν* indicates a more or less deep thrust,

<sup>1</sup> ἄ : εἶρον αὐτον ἤδη τεθνηκότα και ου, instead of ὡς . . . τεθνηκότα, ου

in contrast to a cut. This term is sometimes used in Homer to designate mortal wounds.—Is the fact of the outflowing of the blood and water to be regarded as a natural phenomenon? In general, undoubtedly, when a dead body is pierced, no liquid comes forth from it; nevertheless, if one of the large vessels is reached, it may happen that there will flow from the wound a blackish blood covered with a coating of serum. Can this be what John calls *blood and water*? This is improbable. *Ebrard* accordingly supposes that the lance reached the deposits of extravasated blood. *Gruner* (*Commentatiò de morte Jesu Christi vera*, Halle, 1805) also has this opinion. He thinks that the lance pierced the aqueous deposits which, during this long-continued torture, had been formed around the heart, and then the heart itself. *William Stroud* (London, 1847) alleges phenomena observed in cases of sudden death in consequence of cramp of the heart. These explanations are all of them quite improbable. The expression: *blood and water*, naturally denotes two substances flowing simultaneously, but to the eyes of the spectators distinct, a thing which has no place in any of these suppositions. *Baur*, *Strauss*, etc., conclude from this that there is a necessity for a symbolic interpretation, and find here again the purely ideal character of the narrative. The author meant to express by this fact of his own invention the abundance of spiritual life which will, from this moment, flow forth from the person of Christ (*Baur*); the water more especially represents the Holy Spirit, the blood the Holy Supper, with an allusion to the custom of mixing the wine of this sacrament with water (*Strauss*, in his new *Life of Jesus*). But what idea must we form of the morality of a man who should solemnly affirm that *he had seen* (ver. 35) that which he had the consciousness of having beheld only *in idea*. In favor of this allegorical explanation an appeal has been made to the words in 1 John v. 6: “*He came not by water only, but by water and blood.*” But these words do not have the least connection with the fact with which we are occupied. The *water* of which John speaks in his epistle denotes, as iii. 5, baptism: Jesus did not come, like the forerunner, only with the baptism of water, the symbol of purification, but with the *blood* which brings the expiation itself. In our view there remains but one explanation: it is that which admits that this mysterious fact took place outside of the laws of common physiology, and that it is connected with the exceptional nature of a body which sin had never tainted and which moved forward to the resurrection without having to pass through dissolution. At the instant of death, the process of dissolution, in general, begins. The body of Jesus must have taken at that moment a different path from that of death: it entered upon that of glorification. He who was the *Holy One of God*, in the absolute sense of the word, was also *absolutely exempt from corruption* (Ps. xvi. 10). This is the meaning which the evangelist seems to me to have ascribed to this unprecedented phenomenon, of which he was a witness. Thus is explained the affirmation, having somewhat the character of an oath, by which, in the following verse, he certifies its reality; not that the affirmation of ver. 35 refers only to this fact; for it certainly has reference to the totality of the facts mentioned vv. 33, 34 (see below). *Weiss* holds that

there is a natural phenomenon here which cannot be certainly explained ; but he thinks that John saw in the blood the means of our redemption and in the water the symbol of its purifying force. In this case, a grossly superstitious idea must be imputed to the apostle : by what right ? The text says not a word of such a symbolic sense. According to *Reuss*, also, the blood designates the redemptive death, and the water baptism, and we have here a mystical explanation of a fact which struck the author. All this has no better foundation than the opinion of those who think that the evangelist wished to combat the idea that Jesus was not really dead (*Lücke, Neander*), or the idea that He had only an apparent body (*Olshausen*). The first of these ideas is entirely modern ; the second ascribes to the author an argument which has no force, since the Docete did not in the least deny the sensible *appearances* in the earthly life of Jesus.—The absence of all corruption in the *Holy One of God* implied the beginning of the restoration of life from the very moment when, at death, in the case of every sinner the work of dissolution which is to destroy the body commences.

Vv. 35-37. “*And he who saw it has borne witness, and his testimony is true,<sup>1</sup> and he knows that he says true, that you also<sup>2</sup> may believe.” 36. *For these things came to pass that the Scripture might be fulfilled: No one of his bones<sup>4</sup> shall be broken.* 37. *And another word also says: They shall look on him whom they pierce.*”—Some (*Weisse, Schwetzer, Hilgenfeld, Weizsäcker, Keim, Baumlein, Reuss, Sabatier*) claim that in these words of ver. 35 the author of the Gospel expressly distinguishes himself from the apostle, and that he professes to be only the reporter of the oral testimony of the latter. He declares to the readers of the Gospel that John the apostle saw this, that he bore witness of it, and that he had the inward consciousness of saying a true thing in relating this fact. Thus these words, which have always been regarded as one of the strongest proofs of the Johannean composition of our Gospel, are transformed into a formal denial of its apostolic origin. We have already examined this question in the *Introduction*, Vol. I., pp. 193-197. We will also present here the following observations :*

1. As to the school of *Baur*, which asserts that the author all along wishes to pass himself off as the apostle, it should evidently have been on its guard against accepting this explanation. It has not been able, however, to refrain from catching at the bait ; but it has clearly perceived the contradiction into which it is brought thereby ; see the embarrassment of *Hilgenfeld* with respect to this question, *Einl.*, p. 731. In fact, if the author wishes throughout his entire work to pass himself off as the apostle John, how should he here openly declare the contrary ? The reply of *Hilgenfeld* is this : “*He forgets (falls out of) his part*” (p. 732). A singular inadvertence, surely, in the case of a *falsarius* of such consummate skill as the one to whom these critics ascribe the composition of our Gospel !—Other critics, such as *Reuss*, find themselves no less embarrassed by the apparent advantage

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  : ἀληθης, instead of ἀληθινη.

(E G etc.) and the other Mm.

<sup>2</sup> 15 Mj. ( $\aleph$  A B etc.) 25 Mm. It. Vulg. Syr. read καὶ before ὑμεῖς (“*that you also may believe*”) ; T. R. omits this word with 7 Mj.

<sup>3</sup>  $\aleph$  B : πιστευητε instead of πιστευσητε.

<sup>4</sup> 60 Mm. It<sup>perique</sup> ; ἀπ’ αὐτου instead of αὐτου (according to Exod. xii. 46, in the LXX).

which they yet try to derive from these words. In fact, there exists in ch. xxi. 24 an analogous passage in which the depositaries of our Gospel—those who received the commission to publish it—expressly attest the identity of the *redactor* of this work with the apostle-witness of the facts, with *the disciple whom Jesus loved*. How can we explain such a declaration on the part of the depositaries of the work, if the author had in our passage himself attested his non-identity with the apostle, the eye-witness? Do they knowingly falsify? *Reuss* does not dare to affirm this. Are they mistaken? It would be necessary to conclude from this that those who published the book had themselves never read the work to which they give the attestation in opposition to his. Still more, if they received from the author his book to be published, they must have known him personally; moreover, it is from the personal knowledge which they have of him and his character that they come forward as vouchers for his veracity. How, then, could they be deceived with respect to him?—2. And on what reasons are suppositions so impossible made to rest? Above all, the pronoun *ἐκεῖνος* is alleged, by which the author designates the apostle, distinguishing him from himself. But throughout the whole course of our Gospel we have seen this pronoun employed, not to oppose a nearer subject to a more remote subject, but in an exclusive or strongly affirmative sense, with the design of emphasizing somewhat the subject to which it refers; comp. i. 18, v. 39, vii. 20, ix. 51, xix. 31, etc., and very particularly ix. 37, where we see that when the one who speaks does so by presenting himself objectively and speaking of himself in the third person, he can very properly use this pronoun.<sup>1</sup> Being forced to speak of himself in this case, John uses this pronoun, because he had *alone* been witness of the special fact which he relates.—3. *Keim* no longer insists on this philological question; he makes appeal to “rational logic,” which does not allow us to hold that a writer describes himself objectively at such length. But comp. St. Paul, 2 Cor. xii. 3! And it is precisely “rational logic” which does not allow us to ascribe to another writer, different from John, the affirmation: *And his testimony is true*. A disciple of John declaring to the Church that the apostle, his master, did not falsify or was not the dupe of an illusion! The first of these attestations would be an insult to his master himself; the second, an absurdity; for has he the right of affirming anything respecting a fact which he has not seen and which he knows only by the testimony of John himself?—4. *Reuss* rests upon the perfect *μεμαρτύρηκε*, *has borne witness*. The narrative of the witness, according to this, is presented as a fact which was long since past. But comp. i. 34, where the: *I have borne witness*, applies to the declaration which John the Baptist has just uttered at the very moment. The same is the case here; this verb applies to the declaration which the author has just made in the preceding lines respecting the fact related: “It is said; the testimony is given and it continues henceforth;” such is the sense of the perfect.—5. It seems to me that we must, above all, take account of the expression: “*He knows that he says true*.” Here is the meaning which we are forced

<sup>1</sup> See on the use of the pronoun *ἐκεῖνος* in the 497-506, and *Buttmann, ibid.*, 1860, pp. 505-536. Fourth Gospel, *Sleitz, Stud. und Krit.*, 1859, pp.

to give to these words : "The witness from whom I have the fact knows that he says true." But by what right can the writer bear testimony of the consciousness which this witness has of the truth of what he says ? One testifies as to one's own consciousness, not that of another.—6. *Hilgenfeld, Keim, Baumlein, Reuss, Sabatier*, cite as analogous xxi. 24. "This is the disciple (the beloved disciple) who testifies these things and wrote these things ; and we know that his testimony is true." But the very similarity in the expressions makes us perceive so much more clearly the difference between them. The attestants say, not as in our passage : "he knows (*οἶδε*) that he says true," but : "we know (*οἶδαμεν*) that he says true ;" they do what the evangelist should have done in our passage, if he had, like them, wished to distinguish himself from the apostle ; they use the first person : *we know*.

The adjective *ἀληθινή* does not here, any more than elsewhere, mean *true* (*ἀληθής*) ; the meaning is : a real testimony, which truly deserves the name, as announcing a fact truly seen. *Καὶ ὑμεῖς, you also* : "you who read, as well as I who have seen and testified." The question is not of belief in the fact reported, but of *faith* in the absolute sense of the word, of their faith *in Christ*, which is to derive its confirmation from this fact and from those which are mentioned afterwards, as it was these facts which had already confirmed the faith of the author himself. It is not only from the fact of the outflowing of the blood and water that this result is expected. The *for* of ver. 36 proves that the question is of the way in which the two prophecies recalled to mind in vv. 36,37 were fulfilled by the three facts related in vv. 33,34.—The first prophecy is taken from Exod. xii. 46 and Num. ix. 13 ; not from Ps. xxxiv. 21, as *Baumlein* and *Weiss* think ; for this last passage refers to the preservation of the *life* of the righteous one, not to that of the integrity of His body. The application which the evangelist makes of the words implies as admitted the typical significance of the Paschal lamb ; comp. xiii. 18, a similar typical application.—The Paschal lamb belonged to God and was the figure of the Lamb of God. This is the reason why the law so expressly protected it against all violent and brutal treatment. It is also the reason why the remains of its flesh were to be burned immediately after the supper.

As the prophecy was fulfilled by what did not take place with reference to Jesus (the breaking of the legs), it was also fulfilled at the same time by what *did* take place in relation to Him (the thrust of the lance), ver. 37. Zechariah (xii. 10) had represented Jehovah as *pierced* by His people, in the person of the Messiah. The action of the Jews in delivering Jesus up to the punishment of the cross had fully realized this prophecy. But this fulfilment must take a still more literal character (see on xii. 15, xviii. 9, xix. 24). The meaning of the Hebrew term ירר, *they have pierced*, was considerably weakened by the LXX, who undoubtedly deemed this expression too strong as applied to Jehovah, and rendered it by *κατωρχήσαντο, they insulted*, outraged God by idolatry. The evangelist goes back to the Hebrew text ; comp. also Apoc. i. 7. The term *they shall look on, ὄψονται*, refers to that which will take place at the time of the conversion of the Jews, when in this Jesus, rejected by them, they shall recognize their Messiah. The look

in question is that of repentance, of supplication, of faith, which they will then cast upon Him (*εις ὁν*); a striking scene magnificently described in the same prophetic picture, Zech. xii. 8-14.

In order to understand clearly what John felt at the moment which he here describes, let us imagine a believing Jew, thoroughly acquainted with the Old Testament, seeing the soldiers approaching who were to break the legs of the three condemned persons. What is to take place with regard to the body of the Messiah, more sacred even than that of the Paschal lamb? And lo, by a series of unexpected circumstances, he sees this body rescued from any brutal operation! The same spear-thrust which spares it the treatment with which it was threatened realizes to the letter that which the prophet had foretold! Were not such signs fitted to strengthen his faith and that of the Church? This is what John had experienced as an eye-witness and what he meant to say in this passage, vv. 31-37.

The entombment of Jesus: vv. 38-42.

Here, as in the preceding passage, John completes the narrative of his predecessors. He makes prominent the part which was taken by Nicodemus in the funeral honors paid to Jesus, and sets forth clearly the relation between the advanced *hour* of the day and the *place* of the sepulchre where the body was laid. He thus accounts for facts whose relation the Synoptics do not indicate.

Vv. 38-40. "After this<sup>1</sup> Joseph of Arimathea, who was a disciple of Jesus, but secretly for fear of the Jews, went and asked Pilate that they might take away the body of Jesus; and Pilate gave him leave. He came<sup>2</sup> therefore, and took away<sup>3</sup> the body of Jesus.<sup>3</sup> 39. Nicodemus, who at the first came to Jesus by night, came also, bringing<sup>4</sup> a mixture<sup>4</sup> of myrrh and aloes, about a hundred pound weight. 40. They took therefore the body of Jesus and wrapped it in<sup>5</sup> linen cloths with the spices, according as the Jews are accustomed to bury."—The request of the Jews, ver. 31, refers to the three condemned persons; but, as John has observed, the order of Pilate had only been executed with reference to two of them. Joseph then presents himself before him with an entirely new request, which applies to Jesus only. *Bäumlein*: "Sometimes, especially on occasion of a feast, the bodies of those crucified were given up to relatives. Philo in *Flacc.*, §10." Mark relates that Pilate, on hearing this request, was astonished that Jesus was already dead—a fact which, according to *Strauss*, contradicts the permission which he had just given for the breaking of the legs. But this operation did not cause death immediately, as *Strauss* himself acknowledges; it served only to make it sure. Pilate therefore might be astonished that the death of Jesus was so speedily accomplished. Perhaps also his surprise was caused by the fact which was reported to him, that Jesus was dead even before the performing of this operation. For, as is also attested by Mark xv. 44, he caused a detailed account of the way in which the things

<sup>1</sup> Δε is omitted by 7 Mj. (N A B etc.) It.

<sup>2</sup> Instead of ηλθεν and ηρην, N It<sup>sup</sup>iq read ηλθον and ηραν (they came and they took away).

<sup>3</sup> Instead of το σωμα του Ι., B L X A read το σωμα αυτου; N: αυτον; It<sup>sup</sup>erique; αυτο.

<sup>4</sup> N reads εχων (having), instead of φερων.

N B: ελιγμα (a roll) instead of μυγμα.

<sup>5</sup> N B K L X Y II It<sup>sup</sup>iq Vulg. omit εν before οδοιτις.

had taken place to be given him by the centurion who had taken charge of the crucifixion.—*Arimathea* probably denotes, not the city of *Rama*, two leagues north of Jerusalem, or the other *Rama*, now *Ramleh*, ten leagues north-west of the capital, near to Lydda, but *Ramathaim* (the noun, with the article represented by the syllable *ar*), in Ephraim, the birthplace of Samuel (1 Sam. i. 1). In any case, Joseph was now settled at Jerusalem with his family, since he possessed here a burial-place, but only recently, because the sepulchre had not yet been used.—By mentioning Joseph and Nicodemus, John brings out, in the case of both, the contrast between their present boldness and the cautiousness of their previous conduct. That which, as it seemed, must completely dishearten them—the ignominious death of Jesus—causes the faith of these members of the Jewish aristocracy to break forth conspicuously, and delivers them from all human fear. No doubt, on seeing the Lord suspended on the cross, Nicodemus recalls to mind the type of the brazen serpent which Jesus had set before him at first (iii. 14).—Τὸ πρῶτον designates here, as in x. 40, the beginning of Jesus' ministry. If Nicodemus had been for John, as *Reuss* seems to affirm, merely a fictitious type, how could he make him appear again here as a real and acting person, and this while expressly recalling the scene of ch. iii. ?—Myrrh is an odoriferous gum ; aloes, a sweet-scented wood. After they had been pounded, there was made of them a mixture which was spread over the whole shroud in which the body was wrapped. Probably this cloth was cut into bandages to wrap the limbs separately. The words : "As the Jews are accustomed," contrast this mode of embalming with that of the Egyptians, who removed the intestines and, by much longer and more complicated processes, secured the preservation of the corporeal covering.—The hundred pounds recall to mind the profusion with which Mary had poured the spikenard over the feet of Jesus, ch. xii. ; it is a truly royal homage. The Synoptics tell us that the holy women had the intention also, on their part, to complete this provisional embalming, but only after the Sabbath.

Vv. 41, 42. "Now there was in the place where he was crucified a garden, and in the garden a new sepulchre wherein no one had ever yet been laid." 42. It was there that they laid Jesus, because of the Preparation of the Jews ; for the sepulchre was near."—According to Matthew, the sepulchre belonged to Joseph himself, and this was the reason of the use which was made of it. According to John, this sepulchre was chosen because of its proximity to Golgotha, since the Sabbath was about to begin. These two reasons, far from contradicting, complete each other. What purpose would the proximity of the sepulchre have served, if it had not belonged to one of the Lord's friends ? And it was certainly the circumstance that Joseph owned this sepulchre near the place of crucifixion, which suggested to him the idea of asking for the body of Jesus.—John and Luke (xxiii. 53) remark that the sepulchre was new. Comp. Luke xix. 30 : "You shall find a colt tied whereon yet never man sat." These are providential facts, which belong to the royal glory of Jesus. When a king is received, objects which have not

<sup>1</sup> N B : ἡν τεθειμενος, instead of ετεθη.

yet been used are consecrated to his service.—The expression . *the Preparation of the Jews*, signifies, according to those who hold that the death of Jesus took place, not on the 14th, but on the 15th : *the Friday of the Jews*. But what would be the object of so singular an expression ? It was designed, answers *Rotermund*,<sup>1</sup> to give us to understand how it happened that the day following a Sabbatic day (the 15th) was again a Sabbath (Saturday). By this means the first Sabbath became, as it were, *the preparation* for the second. But if the first of the two days was Sabbatic, like the following one, the carrying away of the body, which they did not wish to do on the next day, could not any more have been done on this day. The quite simple meaning is that it was the hour when *the Jews* (thus is the complement *the Jews* explained) prepared their great national and religious feast by sacrificing the lamb. They were obliged to hasten because, with the setting of the sun, this day of preparation, the 14th, a non-Sabbatic day, came to its close, and because the following day, the 15th, was in that year a doubly Sabbatic day (ver. 31); comp. Luke xxiii. 56.

#### *On the Day of Jesus' Death.*

Respecting the day of the *week* on which the death of Jesus took place, the agreement of the four evangelists is manifest ; it was a Friday (Matt. xxvii. 62, Mark xv. 42, Luke xxiii. 54, John xix. 31). But they appear to differ as to the question whether this Friday was the 14th or the 15th of the month Nisan—an apparently insignificant difference, but yet one which implies a more considerable one. For on this depends the question whether Jesus had celebrated on the preceding evening the Paschal supper with all the rest of the Jewish people,—in that case Jesus would have died on the 15th,—or whether the people were to celebrate this supper later, on the evening of the day of His death,—in this case the day of His death was the 14th. For the Paschal supper was celebrated on the evening which formed the transition from the 14th to the 15th.

#### I.—*The View of John.*

According to John xiii. 1, Jesus celebrated His last supper *before the feast of the Passover*. *Rotermund* (in the article which is cited above) affirms, no doubt, with *Langen*, that the Passover feast began only on the 15th, and that, as a consequence, this supper, which took place *before the feast*, must be placed on the evening of the 14th, and must therefore be identified with the Paschal supper. But see on xiii. 1. John would not have designated this supper simply by the words : “A supper,” or even, if one will have it so, “the supper.” For the benefit of his Greek readers, he could not have refrained from designating this supper as that of *the Passover*.—The passage xviii. 28, notwithstanding all the efforts of some scholars (comp. also *Kirchner*, *Die jüdische Passahfeier*, 1870), plainly declares that the Jewish Paschal supper was not yet celebrated on the morning when Jesus was condemned, and consequently that Jesus was put to death on the 14th, and not on the 15th.—The passages xix. 14, 31, 42 lead to the same result. Neither *Kirchner* nor *Rotermund* has succeeded in proving that expressions such as these : *the Passover Friday*, *the*

<sup>1</sup> *Von Ephraim nach Golgotha, Stud. und Kritik.*, 1876, I.

*Friday of the Jews*, are natural. That it was a Friday is certain ; that the word *παρασκευή* (*preparation*) may designate Friday, as the preparation for the Sabbath, is unquestionable. But that in John's context this term *paraskeuê*, *preparation*, can have the technical sense of Friday, is inadmissible.—After the observations of *Kirchner* and *Luthardt*, I give up alleging xiii. 19 as decisive, although one still asks oneself how a purchase could have been made during the Passover night, all families, whether rich or poor, being at that time gathered around the Paschal table, and all the shops being consequently closed.

## II.—*The Apparent View of the Synoptics.*

This view seems to follow evidently from the three parallels, Matt. xxvi. 17 : "The first day of unleavened bread (the 14th of Nisan), the disciples of Jesus came to him saying, Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee the Passover supper?" Mark xiv. 12 : "And on the first day of unleavened bread, when they sacrificed the Passover, the disciples said to him ;" Luke xxii. 7 : "The day of unleavened bread came, when the Passover must be sacrificed, and he sent Peter and John." It seems altogether natural to place this question of the disciples, or (according to Luke) this commission which Jesus gives to two of them, on the morning of the 14th, when the preparations of the Paschal supper were made for the evening. And from this fact precisely it is that the apparent contradiction to the narrative of John arises ; for, if Jesus gave this order on the 14th in the morning, the supper which the disciples were to prepare for the evening could only be the Paschal supper, from which it would follow that His last supper coincided with the Paschal supper of that year. Now, according to John, as we have just proved, the Jewish Paschal supper must have taken place only on the evening which *followed* that of the last supper of Jesus, on the evening of the day of His death.

Here is one of the greatest differences between the Synoptics and John. Since the earliest times it has attracted the notice of all those who have closely studied the Scriptures. And already in the second century, as we shall see, we encounter numerous traces of the discussions which it has raised.

## III.—*The Attempts at Solution.*

From the time of St. Jerome, the view of the Synoptic narrative became prevalent in the Church ; it continued so even until the Reformation : Jesus had celebrated the Passover with the whole people before He died. But at that epoch the revival of Biblical studies caused the need to be felt of giving a more exact account of the Gospel narratives ; their apparent disagreement was obvious, and the attempt was made to resolve it. *Calvin* and *Theodore Beza*, then *Scaliger* and *Casaubon*, brought out the idea, already expressed by *Eusebius* and *Chrysostom* (see *Tholuck*, p. 41), that the Jews, in order that they might not have to celebrate two successive Sabbatic days (Friday, the 15th of Nisan, as the first day of the feast, and the next day, the 16th, which fell in this year on Saturday), had exceptionally delayed by one day the great day of the feast, while Jesus had, for Himself, kept the legal day. Thus would the fact be explained that He, at this time, celebrated the Passover a day sooner than the rest of the people. It appears that, at the present day also, when the 15th of Nisan falls on a Friday, the Jews transfer the feast from this day to Saturday. This solution is very simple and natural. Only we do not find either in the

New Testament, or in Josephus, or in the Talmud, any trace of such a transposition, which would constitute a grave derogation from the law.

Other reasons have been sought which might lead Jesus in this circumstance to deviate from the generally-received usage. *Stier* has thought that He attached Himself to the mode of action of some sects, like that of the Karaites, who had the custom of celebrating the Paschal supper, not on the evening of the 14th-15th, but on that of the 13th-14th.—*Ebrard* has supposed that because of the great number of lambs to be slain in the temple (sometimes more than 250,000, according to Josephus) from three to six o'clock in the afternoon, the Galileans had been authorized to sacrifice and eat the lamb on the 13th instead of the 14th.—*Serno* applies the same supposition to all the Jews of the dispersion. But these hypotheses have no historical basis, and are, in any case, much less probable than that of the Reformers.—*Rauch* has affirmed that the Israelites in general celebrated the Paschal supper, legally and habitually, on the evening of the 13th-14th, and not that of the 14th-15th. But this opinion, which, even if adopted, would yet not resolve the difficulty, strikes against all the known Biblical and historical data.

*Lutteroth*, in his pamphlet, *Le jour de la préparation*, 1855, and in his *Essai d'interprétation de l'Evangile de saint Matthieu*, 1876, places the day of the conversation of Jesus with His disciples much earlier, on the 10th of Nisan, when the Jews set apart the lamb which was to be sacrificed on the 14th. It was, according to him, on the same 10th day that Jesus was crucified; He remained in the tomb on the 11th, 12th, and 13th; the 14th was the day of His resurrection. This entirely new chronology is shattered by the first word of the conversation. How is it possible that the 10th of Nisan should be called by the evangelists *the first day of unleavened bread*, especially when this determination of the time is made still more precise, as it is in Mark, by the words: “*when the Passover is sacrificed.*” It is true that *Lutteroth* tries to make this *when* refer only to the idea of unleavened bread: “the unleavened bread which is to be eaten when the Passover is sacrificed” (!). The words of Luke xxii. 7: “The day of unleavened bread came, when the Passover must be sacrificed,” are still more rudely handled: it is not an historical fact which Luke relates, it is a moral reflection by means of which the evangelist announces at the beginning that the Passion will have an end (!) (*Essai*, pp. 410, 411<sup>1</sup>).—After all these fruitless attempts, one can understand how a large number of critics limit themselves at the present day to establishing the disagreement and declaring it insoluble; this is what is done by *Lücke*, *Neander*, *Bleek*, *de Wette*, *Steitz*, *J. Müller*, *Weiss*, *de Pressensé*,<sup>2</sup> etc.

#### IV.—*The Truth of John's Narrative.*

But if the contradiction exists, it remains to determine which of the two narratives deserves the preference. Then it must be explained how so grave a difference can have arisen in the Gospel narrative.

<sup>1</sup> We desire to say that, notwithstanding these eccentricities, the works of *Lutteroth* are nevertheless monuments of solid learning and persevering investigation. Pages 60, 76, 77 of the pamphlet on the Passover prove interesting points of contact in Patristic literature with

the particular views of the author respecting this question.

<sup>2</sup> “We regard thus far the contradiction,” says this author (viiith ed.), “as insoluble, while entirely justifying the narrative of John” (p. 603, note).

The critics of the Tübingen school—*Baur, Hilgenfeld, Keim*—are not embarrassed : it is the Synoptics that have preserved the true historical tradition. As to John's narrative, it is a deliberate alteration of the real history, intended, on the one hand, to make the death of Jesus, as the true Paschal lamb, coincide with the time of the sacrificing of the lamb in the temple, and, on the other hand, to throw into the shade the Jewish Paschal supper by making the last supper of Jesus a simple farewell meal. But neither the one nor the other of these ends required a means so compromising as that which is thus ascribed to pseudo-John. Such a disagreement with the first three Gospels, which were already received throughout the whole Church, and with the apostolic tradition, of which these writings were known to be the depositaries, exposed the work of the fourth evangelist to the danger of being greatly suspected, and that in a very useless way for him. For to present Jesus as the true Paschal lamb, there was no need of such a desperate expedient as that of misplacing the well-known day of His death ; it was enough that this event should be placed in the Paschal week ; there was, therefore, nothing to be changed in the tradition of the Church ; comp. the words of Paul in 1 Cor. v. 7 : " Christ, our Passover, has been sacrificed for us ;" those of Peter, 1 Ep. i. 19, and all the passages of the Apocalypse where Christ is called *the Lamb*. As to the Jewish Passover, there was no need in the second century to depreciate it ; it was already replaced everywhere, both in the Church and in the sects, by the Christian supper (*Schüerer*, pp. 29–34).

A second class of critics, as we have seen, try to interpret the texts of John so as to put them in accord with what they think to be the meaning of the Synoptic narrative. They are, for example, *Lightfoot, Thobuck, Olshausen, Hengstenberg, Wieseler, Luthardt, Wichelhaus, Hofmann, Lichtenstein, Lange, Riggenbach, Ebrard, Baumlein, Langen, Keil*. But all their efforts have been unsuccessful in bringing out from John's text a sense contrary to that which is obvious on reading it.

As to the third class, which concedes a real difference between our Gospel narratives, the greater part give the preference to that of John ; thus, among the moderns, *Weiss, Pressensé* (see note on p. 400), *Reuss* himself (*Théol. joh.* pp. 59, 60). And, in fact, if the conflict is real, the choice cannot be doubtful. The witnesses in favor of the historical exactness of John's narrative are the following :

1. *The Synoptics* themselves.—These writings contain a series of facts, and a certain number of words, which are in complete accord with John's narrative and in no less evident disagreement with the view which is attributed to them. If there was an hour sacred to the Jewish conscience, it was that of the Paschal supper ; and yet it was at this hour that a multitude of officers and servants of the chief priests and elders had left their houses and their families, assembled around the Passover table, to go and arrest Jesus in Gethsemane ! Still more, we know that everything which was reprehensible on the Sabbath, as, e.g., to climb a tree, to ride on horseback, to hold a session of a court, was also prohibited on the festival day (*Traité Beza*, v. 2) ; and yet there were held, on that Sabbatic night of the 14th–15th, at least two sessions of the court, in one of which the sentence of death for Jesus was pronounced ; and then all those long negotiations with Pilate, as well as the sending to Herod, took place ; all this, notwithstanding the festival and Sabbatic character of the 15th of Nisan ! It is answered that a session of the court was permitted on the festival day,

provided that the sentence was not put *in writing*, and that, in general, the rule of the *festival days* was less rigorous than that of the *Sabbaths* properly so called. But, at the foundation, all the difference between these two kinds of days is limited to the authorization to prepare the necessary articles of food on the festival day, if even we are allowed to draw a general conclusion from Exod. xii. 16. Now would so slight a difference be sufficient to justify the use of such a day which is here implied?—That Simon of Cyrene, *who is returning from the fields* (Matt. xxvii. 32); that Joseph of Arimathea, who is going to *purchase* a linen cloth (Mark xv. 46); those women who give up embalming the body, because *the Sabbath is drawing near* (Luke xxiii. 56)—is all this explicable on the supposition that the day when these things happened thus was itself a Sabbath day, the 15th of Nisan? No doubt it is answered that Simon was returning from a simple walk in the country, or that he was a countryman who was going to the city; then, that purchases might be made on a festival day, provided they were not *paid for* on the same day. It is nevertheless true that the impression made by the narrative of the Synoptics is that the day of Jesus' death was a *working* day, entirely different from the Sabbath day which was to follow; that it was, consequently, the 14th, and not the 15th of Nisan.

This is what appears also from a certain number of expressions scattered throughout the Synoptic narrative. Thus Matt. xxvi. 18: "My time is at hand; let me keep the Passover at thy house with my disciples." What is the logical connection which unites the two propositions of this message? The only satisfactory relation to be established between them is this: "It is necessary for me to hasten; for to-morrow it will be too late; I shall be no longer here; act, then, so that I may be able to eat the Passover at thy house immediately with my disciples (*τοιῶν*, the present)."—Matt. xxvii. 62: The evangelist calls the Saturday during which the body of Jesus reposed in the tomb: "*the morrow which is after the preparation.*" In this phrase it is impossible that the word *preparation* should have the sense of *Friday*, as if Matthev had meant to say that the Sabbath during which Jesus was in the tomb was *the next day after a Friday!* We do not designate the more solemn day by that which is less so, but the reverse. If the day of the 15th is designated here from its relation to the less solemn day of *the preparation* which had preceded it, it is because this day of preparation had become much more important, as the day of Jesus' death. From this singular phrase, therefore, it follows that Jesus was crucified on the 14th.—The same conclusion must be drawn from Mark xv. 42: "Seeing it was *the Preparation, that is, the day before the Sabbath.*" It is of the day of Jesus' death that Mark thus speaks. Now, it is impossible that Mark, a Jew by birth, should have characterized a day like the 15th of Nisan as a simple Friday, preceding the Sabbath (Saturday), this 15th day being itself a Sabbath of the first rank. And if the expression: *preparation, that is, the day before the Sabbath*, can in the ordinary usage designate a Friday, this technical sense is inapplicable in a context where the reason is explained why a work was allowed which could not be done on the following day. The term *preparation* has here its general sense according to which it is applied to any day of the week preceding a Sabbath. Mark explains thereby the act of Joseph of Arimathea in burying Jesus, after having bought a linen cloth. "All this was possible," he says, "because it was the preparation, the day before the Sabbath and *not the Sabbath.*" This is what the expression in Luke

xxiii. 54 also signifies : "That day was the preparation, and the Sabbath was about to dawn."

All these facts and words, no doubt, do not imply that the redactors of the Synoptic narratives fully understood the conclusion to be drawn from them as to the day of Jesus' death. But they are indications, which are so much the more significant since they seem to be unconscious, of the real tradition relative to the day of this death and of the complete conformity of this tradition with the narrative of John.

2. *The Talmud*.—Some passages of this monument of the Jewish memorials and usages declare expressly that Jesus *was suspended on the cross on the evening of the Passover* (bérev happésach), that is to say, in the Jewish language, the evening before the Passover. The erroneous details which are sometimes mingled in these passages with this fundamental statement do not at all diminish the value of the latter, because it is reproduced several times and identically—a fact which indicates an established tradition. If it is objected that the Jewish scholars derived this statement, not from their own tradition, but from our Gospels, this is to acknowledge that they understood the latter as we ourselves understand them.

3. *St. Paul*.—*Keim* cites this apostle as a convincing witness in favor of the Synoptic view. We recognize, he says, in the institution of the Holy Supper (1 Cor. xi.), all the forms of the Jewish Paschal supper—a fact which can be explained only if this last supper of Jesus coincided with the Passover, and if it consequently took place on the evening of the 14th–15th, and not on the evening of the 13th–14th. But Jesus may very well have used the forms of the Paschal supper on an evening before that on which that supper was celebrated; for, as He says Himself, "his time was at hand," and He was forced to anticipate. From the expression of Paul in 1 Cor. xi. 23 : "The Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed," it follows rather that that night was not the night of the Paschal supper; otherwise Paul would have characterized it in another way than by the betrayal of Judas.

All the witnesses whom we are able to consult, even the Synoptics, who are set in opposition to John, do homage, therefore, to the accuracy of his narrative.

#### V.—*The real Meaning of the Synoptic Narrative.*

But, I would ask, is it indeed certain that the Synoptics really say what they are made to say? They say expressly that "the first day of unleavened bread" (Matt., Mark, Luke), "when the Passover was sacrificed" (Mark), "came" (Luke), and that "the disciples asked Jesus" (Matt., Mark), or that Jesus Himself, taking the initiative, sent John and Peter from Bethany to Jerusalem (Luke), with a view to seeking a place for celebrating the Passover. This conversation is unhesitatingly placed on the morning of the 14th of Nisan for the very simple reason that the days are reckoned, as we ourselves reckon them, making the official day coincide with the natural day. But, in calculating thus, it is forgotten that among the Jews the official day began at six o'clock in the evening, and that thus, when it is said : "The day of unleavened bread came," this indication, properly understood, places us, not in the morning of the 14th, but in the evening of the 13th–14th. Taking the Synoptics literally, we are obliged to hold that the conversation between Jesus and the disciples of which they tell us took place, not on the 14th in the morning, but late in the afternoon of the 13th, *between the two evenings*, according to

the customary expression<sup>1</sup>—that is, between the moment when the sun sinks to the horizon and that when it disappears, a moment which is the transition point between the civil day and the day following.

*Rotermund* asserts, no doubt, that, notwithstanding this official way of reckoning the days, it was always the beginning and the end of the *natural* day which determined the popular language. But the contrary follows from Luke xxiii. 54, which designates the last moment of Friday evening by the words: "It was the preparation, and the *Sabbath* was about to dawn," as well as from the phrase which was customary among the Jews, according to which *erev haschabbath*, *evening of the Sabbath*, denotes the evening, not of Saturday, but of Friday. Moreover, we can cite a telling fact taken from Jewish life at the time of Jesus. On the 16th of Nisan, in the morning, the sacred sheaf was offered as the first-fruits of the entire harvest of the year. This sheaf was cut in a field near to Jerusalem, on the preceding day at evening, or, as we should say, on the 15th at evening. The messengers of the Sanhedrim arrived in the field followed by the people: "Has the sun set?" they asked.—"It has," answered the people.—"Am I to cut?"—"Yes, cut."—"With this sickle?"—"Yes."—"Into this basket?"—"Yes."—And why all these formalities? Because the 15th was a Sabbath day, and because manual labor, like that of the reaper, must not be done until after it was established that the 15th was ended, and until the 16th, a working day, had begun. We see from this how deeply the way of reckoning days, which we attribute here to the Synoptics (from evening to evening, and not from morning to morning), had penetrated into the Jewish social life. There is also a circumstance which comes to the support of what we are here saying. It was already alleged by *Clement of Alexandria*, and its importance has been acknowledged by *Strauss*. The crowd of pilgrims was so great in Jerusalem at the Passover feast, that no one waited until the morning of the 14th to secure for himself the place where he might celebrate the Paschal supper with his family in the evening. It was on the 13th that this search for a place was attended to. So *Clement of Alexandria* calls the 13th the *προετοιμασία*, the *pro-preparation*; <sup>2</sup> for the preparation itself was the day of the 14th. It was certainly, therefore, on the day of the 13th, and not that of the 14th, that the disciples spoke to the Lord, or He to them, with the purpose of procuring the place which they needed for the next day at evening.<sup>3</sup> The conversation reported by the Synoptics must have taken place, therefore, at the latest, about five or six o'clock in the afternoon of the 13th, according to our mode of reckoning the days. Jesus, at that time, sent to Jerusalem the two disciples in whom He felt most confidence, charging them to secure a room. In the thought of all the disciples, it was for the next day at evening; but Jesus gives His two messengers to understand that it was for that same evening. This is what the terms of the message imply which He intrusted to them for the host whom He had in view: "*My time is at hand*: I must hasten." And why this course of

<sup>1</sup> Exod. xii. 6: "The whole assembly of the children of Israel shall kill the lamb *between the two evenings*"—that is, late in the afternoon of the 14th.

<sup>2</sup> *Clement* expresses himself thus: "On the 13th He taught His disciples the mystery of the type of the lamb, when they asked Him, saying: Where wilt thou that we prepare for

thee the Passover? For this day was the preparation of the Passover."

<sup>3</sup> *Strauss* himself says (*Leben Jesu für das Volk*, p. 533): "It was naturally difficult, if not impossible, in view of the crowd of foreign pilgrims, to procure on the morning of the first day of the feast a place in the city for the evening."

action, which was full of mystery? The reason for it is simple. Judas must not know in advance the house where Jesus would spend this last evening with His disciples.—From six to eight or nine o'clock, the disciples would have time enough for preparing the supper, even for killing and preparing the lamb, which was already set apart since the 10th of Nisan. Undoubtedly they did not sacrifice it in the temple. But could they have done this, even on the official day and at the official hour—they who must have been excommunicated as adherents of Jesus (ix. 22)? However this may be, according to the primitive institution of the Passover (Exod. xii. 6, 7), it belonged to every Israelite to sacrifice his lamb in his own house; the sacrificing in the temple was a matter of human tradition. And at that time, when the Israelitish Passover was about to come to an end, to be replaced by the sacramental supper of the new covenant, it was altogether natural to return to the simplicity of the starting-point. The priestly sacrificing was useless when the typical lamb had no longer any other part to fill than that of serving as the inauguration of the new supper which was to replace the old. It has been objected (*Keim, Luthardt*) that Jesus did not have the right to change the legal day of the Passover. But if He was *the Lord of the Sabbath*, the corner-stone of the whole ceremonial law (Mark ii. 28), He was certainly the same also with respect to the Passover. The legal Paschal supper was no longer for Him, at that moment, anything but the calyx, withered henceforth, from the bosom of which the commemorative supper of the perfect Redemption was about to blossom.

Let us also observe an interesting coincidence between the well-known Jewish usages and the narrative of the Synoptics, as we have just explained it. On the evening of the 13th, about six o'clock, the lamps were lighted in order to search the most obscure corners of the houses and to remove every particle of leaven. Then, before the stars appeared, a man went from every house to draw the pure water with which the unleavened bread must be kneaded. Does not this usage very naturally explain the sign given to Peter and John when Jesus said to them: "On entering the city, you will meet a man bearing a pitcher of water; follow him into the house where he shall enter" (Luke xxii. 10)?

The solution which we here present is not new; it is at the foundation the same which was already set forth in the second century by the two writers who were especially occupied with this question at the time when it seems to have deeply engaged the attention of the Church, *Apolinarius*<sup>1</sup> of Hierapolis and *Clement* of Alexandria.<sup>2</sup> The first expresses himself thus: "The day of the 14th is the true Passover of the Lord, the great sacrifice, in which the Son of God, put in the place of the lamb, was delivered up to be crucified." The second says, with still more precision: "In the preceding years, Jesus had celebrated the feast by eating the Paschal lamb according as [on the day when] the Jews sacrificed it. But on the 13th, the day on which the disciples interrogated Him, He taught them the mystery [of the type of the lamb]. . . . It was on this day (the 13th) that the consecration of the unleavened bread and the pro-preparation of the Passover took place; . . . and our Saviour suffered on the day following (the 14th): for He was Himself the true Passover. . . . And this is

<sup>1</sup> We write the name thus according to the ordinary usage (instead of *Apolinarius*).

<sup>2</sup> In the fragments of different works preserved in the *Chronicon Paschale*, a compilation

of extracts from ancient authors, made from the fourth to the seventh century, and discovered in Sicily in the sixteenth century (*Le jour de la préparation*, by Lutteroth, p. 59).

the reason why the chief priests and scribes, when leading Him to Pilate, did not enter into the Prætorium, that they might not be defiled and might eat the Passover in the evening without any hindrance." In reality, therefore, we have only reproduced Clement's solution in the most violent of the Paschal disputes of the second century, of which we shall soon speak. *Weiss*, who rejects every solution, yet acknowledges that, strictly speaking, Mark xiv. 12 is the only passage which is opposed to what we have just set forth. What seems to him incompatible with it is the remark: "The first day of unleavened bread, when the Passover was sacrificed." But why could not these last words be applied to the evening of the 13th, if this evening, according to the Jewish manner of reckoning, belonged already to the 14th, on the afternoon of which the lamb was sacrificed? *Weiss* cannot himself refrain from adding that, in any case, the question of the disciples, if placed in the morning of the 14th, is improbable, for the people did not ever expect to occupy themselves at that time with the place of the supper. *De Pressensé* has nothing else to object except the words of Matt. xxvi. 20: "And when the evening was come, he reclined at table with the Twelve," which implies, he says, that the preparations for the supper were made, not a few moments earlier in the evening, but during the course of the day. This remark would perhaps be well founded if the evangelist had had in view, in writing these lines, the question which occupies us. But Matthew does not seem, any more than the other two Synoptics, to have accounted for the problem which is raised by the traditional account; he simply meant to say that this last supper of Jesus took place, not in the daytime, but in the evening.

It is probable that two circumstances contributed to the want of clearness which prevails in the Synoptical narration: first, the very easy confounding of the civil and natural day, and then the fact that the institution of the Holy Supper had impressed on this last supper a character very similar to that of the Paschal feast.

Finally, let us recall to memory the lights which exegesis has asked from astronomy with respect to this question. The question being to determine whether, in the year of Jesus' death, the great Sabbath day of the 15th of Nisan fell on Friday, as the Synoptic narrative, or on Saturday, as the narrative of John implies, the calculation of the lunar phases might serve, it was thought, to decide the question. Two astronomers set themselves to the work, *Wurm*, of Göttingen (*Bengel's Archiv.*, 1816, II.), and *Oudemann*, Professor at Utrecht, (*Revue de théologie*, 1863, p. 221). But it is necessary to begin by determining the year of Jesus' death, and scholars still differ on this point. *Ideler* and *Zumpt* place it in 29; *Winer*, *Wieseler*, *Lichtenstein*, *Caspari*, *Pressensé*, etc., in 30; *Ewald*, *Renan*, in 33; *Keim*, in 35; *Hitzig*, in 36. In this state of things, the two astronomers have extended their calculation to the whole series of years 29-36 of our era. The result, as to the year 30, which we think, with most of the critics, to be the year of the death, is the following: In this year, the 15th of Nisan fell on a Friday. This result would condemn our explanation; but *Caspari*, taking up anew the calculation of *Wurm*, starting from the same data as this astronomer, has arrived at the opposite result. According to him, in the year 30 the 15th of Nisan was Saturday, as it must be according to our explanation. The fact is, that we find ourselves here face to face with the incalculable uncertainties and subtleties of the Jewish calendar. *Wurm* himself declares that one can speak here only of probabilities, that there

will ever remain an uncertainty of one or two days. Now, everything depends on a single day (*Keim*, III., p. 490-500). It is safer to work upon positive texts than upon such unsettled foundations. And as for ourselves, everything being carefully weighed, we think that the most probable date of Jesus' death may be stated thus : *Friday, the 14th of Nisan (7th of April), in the year 30.*

We are happy to agree, on the question of the relation between John and the Synoptics, with some modern scholars : *Krümmler, Darmstadt Litteraturblatt*, Feb., 1858 ; *Baggesen, Der Apostel Johannes*, 1869 ; *Andree*, in the *Beweis des Glaubens, Der Todestag Jesu*, July to September, 1870.—On the consequences of the historical superiority of John's narrative, with reference to the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel, see *Introd.*, Vol. I., pp. 77-79.

#### VI.—*Glance at the History of the Paschal Controversies.*

The fact which lies at the foundation of that long disagreement between the primitive churches is the following : The churches of Asia Minor celebrated the Paschal feast by fasting during the whole of the 14th of Nisan and by communicating on the evening of this day, at the time when the Jews were eating the lamb. The other churches of Christendom, Rome at their head, fasted, on the contrary, during the days which preceded the Passover Sunday, which was always the Sunday that followed the 14th ; then they received the sacrament in the morning of this Passover Sunday.—In both cases the communion terminated the fast.

*First phase of the discussion.* About 155,<sup>1</sup> Polycarp, in a visit which he makes to Rome, has a conversation on this subject with Anicetus, the bishop of Rome. Each defends the rite of his own church in the name of an *apostolic tradition* of which it claimed to be the depository (originating at Ephesus from John and Philip, at Rome from Paul and Peter). There is no proof that on this occasion they entered within the exegetical and dogmatic domain of the question. The ecclesiastical peace remained undisturbed. "The diversity in the rite served rather," as *Irenæus* says, "to establish agreement in faith."<sup>2</sup>

*Second phase.* Fifteen years later, in 170, there breaks out, in the midst even of the churches of Asia, at Laodicea, a disagreement on the subject of the Passover. There are persons there—who are they? we shall have to examine this point—who, like the Asiatics, celebrate the 14th in the evening, but resting upon this fact : that it was on the 14th in the evening that Jesus instituted the Supper, in conformity with the time prescribed by the law for the Paschal supper, and they rest upon the narrative of Matthew, according to which the Lord was crucified on the 15th.<sup>3</sup> We see that from the domain of tradition the question is carried to that of exegesis. *Melito* is the first who writes on this subject, with what view we do not know. Then, on occasion (*ἐξ αἰτίας*) of his book—not against him, as *Schürer* still claims—*Apollinaris*<sup>3</sup> and *Clement of Alexandria* also take up the pen. Both, according to the fragments quoted in the *Chronicon Paschale*, prove that Jesus celebrated His last supper on the

<sup>1</sup> Recent discoveries, due especially to Waddington, seem to prove that the martyrdom of Polycarp occurred in 155 or 156, and not later, as was supposed.

<sup>2</sup> *Letter to Victor* (Euseb. II. E., v. 24).

<sup>3</sup> The following are the words which Hippolytus, in the *Philosophumena*, puts into the

mouth of these persons : "The Lord kept the Passover and suffered on that day ; *this is the reason why I should do as He did.*" Comp. also the answer which Apollinaris gives to them, that "in that case the Gospels would contradict each other" (*Introd.*, Vol. I., p. 143).

13th, and that He died on the 14th. They specially allege John's narrative in favor of this view.

But who are the Laodicean adversaries whom these two writers oppose? *Baur, Hilgenfeld, Schürer, Luthardt*, answer: They are the churches of Asia themselves, with their celebration of the 14th. Apollinaris was even in Asia the adversary of the Asiatic rite. It is difficult to believe this. For, 1. Eusebius presents the churches of Asia before us as unanimous: "The churches of the whole of Asia thought, according to an ancient tradition, that they must observe the 14th by the celebration of the Holy Supper." If this consensus of all the churches of Asia had been broken by so considerable a bishop and doctor as Apollinaris of Hierapolis, Eusebius, the pronounced adversary of the Asiatic rite, would not have failed to notice it. Baur alleges that a little later *Polycrates*, when enumerating in his letter to Victor, a bishop of Rome, all the illustrious personages who practised the Asiatic rite, does not mention Apollinaris. But he names only the dead. Apollinaris might also be found among the numerous bishops of whom *Polycrates* speaks without naming them, who surrounded him at the time when he was writing his letter, and who gave their assent to it. 2. If Apollinaris had made a division as related to his colleagues in Asia, the dispute would, no doubt, have broken out in his home, at Hierapolis, rather than at Laodicea. 3. The polemic of Apollinaris by no means implies opposition to the Asiatic rite and adhesion to the occidental rite. The adversaries justified their observance of the 14th by resting upon the fact that this was the evening on which Jesus had *instituted the Supper*. Apollinaris remarks that this view puts the first three Gospels in contradiction to that of John. But this does not prevent him from celebrating the 14th also—only for another reason. In any case, it is impossible to understand how this view of Apollinaris, according to which Jesus died on the 14th, not the 15th, could have favored the Roman observance, according to which the Holy Passover Supper was celebrated on the following Sunday. 4. *Schürer* is embarrassed here by a manifest contradiction: According to him, the Asiatic rite did not rest on any fact of the Gospel history, neither on the time of the institution of the Supper nor on the day of Jesus' death. It arose only from the fact that the 14th was the day of the Jewish Paschal supper, which had been simply transformed, in Asia, into the Christian Supper. But, on the other hand, in the presence of the polemics of Apollinaris, he is forced to acknowledge that his adversaries fixed the Supper on the 14th, in remembrance of the day of the *institution of the Supper*. These two grounds of the same observance not coinciding, he ought not to maintain that the Laodiceans combated by Apollinaris are no others than the churches of Asia in general.

It is with reason, therefore, that *Weitzel* and *Steitz*, with whom are associated *Ritschl, Meyer, Réville*, etc., have been led to see in the Laodiceans, contended against by Apollinaris, a Judaizing party which arose in the Church of Asia, and which had as its aim to preserve for the Holy Supper the character of a *complete Jewish Passover supper*, as they imagined that the Lord also had celebrated that supper before He died. Then the polemic of *Apollinaris* and *Clement* takes effect. These people said: "We wish to do as the Lord did [celebrate the Paschal supper on the 14th], and this by eating the Paschal lamb as He did." The two Fathers answer: "The Lord did not do this. He carried back the Paschal supper of the 14th to the 13th in the evening, and this by instituting the Supper." This opinion evidently did not prevent Apollinaris

from remaining faithful to the rite of his Church, since, as Schürer himself acknowledges, if the churches of Asia celebrated the 14th, as did the Laodiceans, it was not as having been the day of the *institution of the Supper*.

I would differ in opinion from *Weitzel* and *Steitz* only on two points: 1. The Laodicean adversaries, against whom Apollinaris contends, do not seem to me to have been an Ebionite sect properly so called, but only a branch of the Church of Asia, with a more pronounced Judaizing tendency. 2. The rite of the churches of Asia did not arise, probably, as these scholars think, from the fact that, in their view, Jesus died on the 14th, but quite simply from the fact that in these churches the day of the Israelitish Paschal supper was maintained. This is what results from the following words of Eusebius: "The churches of Asia thought they must celebrate the 14th, *the day on which the Jews were commanded to sacrifice the lamb*;" then more clearly still from those of Polycrates: "And all my relatives (bishops before me) celebrated the day when *the people removed the leaven*." The Asiatic rite is expressly placed in connection with the *day* of Christ's death only in two passages of the fourth and fifth centuries—one in *Epiphanius*, the other in *Theodoret* (see Schürer, pp. 57, 58)—a fact which shows clearly that this point of view was not the prevailing one at the beginning of the discussion.

*Third phase.* Between 180 and 190 a certain Blastus (comp. the *Adv. Hær.* of the pseudo-Tertullian, c. 22) attempted to transplant the Asiatic rite to Rome. It was probably this circumstance which reawakened the dispute between the Churches of Rome and Asia, represented at this epoch, the one by Victor, the other by Polycrates. The latter, in his letter to Victor, no longer defends his cause by the traditional arguments, as Polycarp had done thirty years before. "He went through *all the Holy Scriptures* before writing (*πάσαν ἁγίαν γραφήν διεληλυθώς*)." And he declares that "his predecessors also observed the 14th according to the Gospel (*κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*)." These words give rise to reflection. It has been sought to get rid of them by means of subtleties (see the embarrassment of *Schürer*, p. 35). They evidently prove, as do those which precede, that Polycrates and the bishops of Asia had succeeded in establishing an agreement *between the Gospels*, by means of which these writings not only did not contradict one another (*τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*, the *one Gospel* in the four), but also were in accord with the law itself (*all the Scriptures*). Such expressions imply that Polycrates and his bishops had found the Asiatic rite confirmed first by the law (the question is of the Paschal institution, Exod. xii., fixing the Paschal supper on the 14th), then by the unanimity of the canonical Gospels, which has no meaning unless Polycrates harmonized the Synoptics with John by interpreting them as we ourselves have done. There is, therefore, a perfect equivalency between these words of Polycrates and that which Apollinaris had maintained against the Laodiceans, when he said: "Not only is their opinion contrary to the law, which requires that the lamb should be sacrificed on the 14th (and consequently that Christ also should die on the 14th), but also there would be [according to the opinion which they defend] disagreement between the Gospels [since, according to them, Matthew fixed the death of Christ on the 15th, while John places it on the 14th]." This dispute was quieted by the efforts of Irenæus and many others, who interposed with Victor and arrested him as he was proceeding to violent measures.

*Fourth phase.* It is marked by the decision of the Council of Nice, in 325, which enjoined upon the Orientals to fall in with the Occidental rite, which

was now generally adopted. "At the end of the matter," says Eusebius (in his *περὶ τῆς τοῦ πάσχα ἑορτῆς*, Schürer, p. 40), "the Orientals yielded;" "and thus," adds the same historian, "they broke finally with the murderers of the Lord, and united with their co-religionists (*ἁποδόξοις*)." In fact, the practical consequence of the Asiatic rite was that the Christians of Asia found themselves to be celebrating the Holy Paschal Supper at the same time as the Jews were celebrating their Passover supper, thus separating themselves from all the other Christians who celebrated the Supper on the following Sunday. This rite became in the view of the other Churches, as it were, the sign of a secret sympathy for the unbelieving Jews. This was what determined its defeat. There were, nevertheless, Christians who, like the Judaizers of Laodicea, persisted in the observance of the 14th for the reason that Jesus had instituted the Supper on that day at evening. They figure under the names of *Audians*, *Quarto-decimans*, in the lists of later heresies. *Athanasius* frankly confesses that they are not easily to be refuted when they allege these words of the Synoptics: "*On the first day of unleavened bread, the disciples came to Jesus*" (Schürer, p. 45).<sup>1</sup> We here come upon the first symptom of the preponderance which the Synoptical narrative finally gained in the Church over that of John, and which it maintained through the middle ages and even to modern times. The Synoptics, more popular than John and apparently more clear, forming besides a group of three against one, and especially no longer encountering in the way of counterpoise the fear of a mingling of the Christian Supper and the Jewish Passover, carried the day in the general feeling. Jerome is the one of the Fathers who contributed most to this victory.

But how are we to explain *the origin of the two observances—the Asiatic and the Roman*—in the second century?<sup>2</sup>—Paul had no fear of bringing into the Church the celebration of the Jewish Passover feast (Acts xx. 6; comp. 1 Cor. v. 7, 8 with xvi. 8). He transformed and spiritualized its rites—this is beyond doubt; the Holy Supper was substituted for the Paschal supper of the lamb and unleavened bread; but the time of the celebration was the same; this seems to follow from Acts xx. 6. John certainly did not do otherwise; it was thus that the celebration of the Holy Supper on the evening of the 14th of Nisan was quite naturally introduced into Asia. But the churches of the West, more estranged from Judaism, felt a certain repugnance to this unity in point of *time* which was established between the Jewish and the Christian feast, and to the kind of dependence in which the simultaneousness placed the second with relation to the first. They therefore threw off the yoke; and, instead of celebrating the Holy Passover Supper on the 14th at evening, as they already had the institution of the weekly Sunday, distinct from that of the Jewish Sabbath, they fixed this ceremony for the morning of the Sunday which in each year followed the 14th of Nisan, or, to speak more properly, the full moon of March.<sup>3</sup> Thus, no doubt, the occidental

<sup>1</sup> It is to one of these obstinate and henceforth schismatic Quarto-decimans that we must apply the words of Eusebius, in the work cited above (Schürer, p. 40): "But if any one says that it is written: *On the first day of unleavened bread.*"—It is obvious that this objection embarrasses Eusebius as well as Athanasius.

<sup>2</sup> Schürer seems to us to have thrown real light on this important and difficult point, pp. 61 ff.

<sup>3</sup> This is the way in which it happens, observes Schürer rightly, that the name Easter is applied at the present time to the day of the resurrection rather than to that of the death.

observance grew up, which finally carried the day over the primitive observance. The Church is free in these matters.

The result of this long and complicated history, so far as relates to the subject which occupies our attention, seems to us to be this : From the time when the Church occupied itself with the exegetical side of the question, it attached itself to the Johannean narrative. It made use of it, on the one hand, to refute by the pen of Apollinaris the exegetical basis on which the Laodicean party rested the observance of the 14th (by making that day, according to Matthew, the day of the *institution of the Supper*) ; on the other hand, to defend against Rome, by the pen of Polycrates, the Asiatic celebration of the 14th, by presenting the Supper as the Jewish Passover spiritualized—that is to say, as the feast of the Christian redemption, the counterpart of the deliverance from Egypt. The matter in question, therefore, for the Church of Asia, was not that of celebrating the 14th of Nisan as the day of the *institution* of the Supper, nor even, properly speaking, as the day of Jesus' *death* (against *Steitz*). It simply *Christianized* the Jewish Passover. The Asiatic observance, therefore, does not furnish, as *Baur* has claimed, an argument against the Johannean origin of the Fourth Gospel ; quite the contrary, the polemic of Apollinaris against the Laodiceans, and that of Polycrates against Victor, are a striking testimony given to the narrative of the Fourth Gospel.

To sum up, the difference between John and the Synoptics may be stated and explained as follows :

In drawing up the oral tradition, the Synoptical writers contented themselves, as he did, with placing the last supper of Christ on the 14th of Nisan, the first day of unleavened bread, without *expressly* distinguishing between the first and the second *evening* of that day. Now, as Jesus had given to this last supper, celebrated on the evening of the 13th–14th, the forms of the Paschal supper, which took place on the evening of the 14th–15th, in order to substitute the Holy Supper for the Paschal feast for the future, a misunderstanding might easily arise ; it might be imagined that this supper was itself the Paschal feast of the 14th, which necessarily had the effect of carrying over the day of the death of Jesus to the 15th. John (as he had done so many times in his work) desired to dissipate the sort of obscurity which prevailed in the Synoptics, and to rectify the misunderstanding to which their narrative might easily lead. He therefore intentionally and clearly re-established the real course of things to which, moreover, the **Synoptic narrative bore testimony at all points.**

## FIFTH PART.

XX. I.—29.

### THE RESURRECTION.

The fourth part of the Gospel has shown us the Jewish people carrying *unbelief* with reference to Jesus even to complete apostasy, and consummating this spiritual crime by the crucifixion of the Messiah. In the fifth we see the fidelity of the disciples raised to complete *faith* by the supreme earthly manifestation of the glory of Jesus—His resurrection.

The narrative of John pursues its independent path through the somewhat divergent narratives of the Synoptics, and, without any effort, gives us a glimpse of their harmony. In a first section (vv. 1–18), the evangelist relates how, in consequence of the report of Mary Magdalene, the two principal apostles attained to faith in the resurrection, and describes the first appearance of Jesus. The second section, vv. 19–23, relates His appearance in the midst of the Twelve, by means of which He established faith in the apostolic company. The third (vv. 24–29) describes the finishing of this work, which remained unfinished after the preceding appearance.

I.—*Mary, Peter and John at the sepulchre; Appearance to Mary: vv. 1–18.*

#### 1. Vv. 1–10.

The entire first part of this section tends towards the words of ver. 8: “*And he saw and believed.*” After this, the appearance of Jesus to Mary Magdalene makes the latter the messenger who should prepare all the disciples for faith, as she had brought the first two to the sepulchre.

Vv. 1–3. “*On the first day of the week, Mary Magdalene goes to the sepulchre early, while it was yet dark, and she sees that the stone is taken away<sup>1</sup> from the sepulchre; 2, she runs therefore and comes to Simon Peter and to the disciple whom Jesus loved, and says to them, They have taken away the Lord from the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid him. 3. Peter therefore went forth, and the other disciple, and they came to the sepulchre.*”—In the expression *μία τῶν σαββάτων*, we may give to the word *σάββατα* the meaning *Sabbath*: “the first day (*μία*) starting from the Sabbath.” But Luke xviii. 12 proves that *σάββατον* or *σάββατα* signifies also the entire *week*, as forming

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  some Mnn. It<sup>111</sup> Cop. Sah. add ἀπο τῆς (from the door of the sepulchre).  
δυνας before ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου ( $\aleph$ ) ἢ τοῦ μνημείου

the interval between two Sabbaths. It is better therefore to explain *μία* : the first [of the days] of the week. The name *Μαγδαληνή* (*Magdalene*) is derived from that of village of *Magdala*, probably *El Megdjl*, two leagues northward of Tiberias, on the borders of the lake of Gennesareth. The greater deliverance which Mary Magdalene owed to Jesus (Luke viii. 2, Mark xvi. 9), the more ardent was her gratitude, the more lively her attachment to His person. John does not speak of the purpose which brought her to the sepulchre, but it is indicated by the Synoptics : it was to embalm the Lord's body. Did she come alone ? This is in itself scarcely probable, at so early an hour in the morning. The Synoptics inform us that she had companions who came with the same intention as herself. They were Mary, the mother of James, Salome, Joanna and some others who had come with Jesus from Galilee (Matt. xxviii. 1, Mark xvi. 1, Luke xxiv. 10). There is in John's narrative itself a word which gives us to understand that she did not come alone. It is the plural *οἶδαμεν*, *we know* ; for, whatever *Meyer* may say, it is impossible to understand by this *we* : I, Mary, and you, the disciples (!). If Mary alone is mentioned, it is because of the part which she plays in the following scene. *Meyer* makes the *οὐκ οἶδα*, *I do not know*, of ver. 13 an objection. But this contrast is precisely what disproves it. There she is alone with the angels, and naturally she speaks only in her own name, as she also says : *My Lord*, and no longer : *the Lord* (ver. 2).—These women or some of them came together. But, as soon as from a distance they saw the tomb open, Mary Magdalene, carried away by her vividness of impression, hastens to go and tell the disciples, while her companions come even to the sepulchre. There is a slight chronological difference between John, Matthew and Luke, who say : "*As it was dark*," or "*at the dawn of day*," and Mark, who says : "*The sun having risen*." Perhaps there were several groups of women in succession whom each evangelist unites in a single one. Hence this slight difference as to the time of arriving. It was during the absence of Mary that her companions received the message of the angel, related by the three Synoptics.—Matthew xxviii. 9, 10 relates that, on their return from the sepulchre, there was an appearance of Jesus to these women. But the narrative in Mark xvi. 8 and especially the words of the two disciples from Emmaus, Luke xxiv. 22, 23 : "They had a vision of angels, saying that he was alive," are incompatible with this fact. This appearance to the *women* is, therefore, no other than the appearance to Mary Magdalene (which is to follow in John) generalized. All the details of the appearance coincide. The First Gospel applies to the entire group what happened to one of its members. As Mary Magdalene saw the Lord only after the other women had returned to the city, we may understand how the two disciples from Emmaus were able to depart from Jerusalem without having heard of any appearance of Jesus (Luke xxiv. 24). There had been, therefore, in fact, no other appearances in the morning of this day, except that of the angels to the women and then to Mary Magdalene, and finally that of Jesus to the latter. There is no reason here for making the loud outcry against our narratives which is uttered by criticism (*Keim*, III., p. 530).

The repetition of the preposition *πρός*, *to*, in ver. 2, leads us to think that the two disciples had different homes, which is natural if John lived with his mother and with Mary, the mother of Jesus.—The term *ἐφίλει*, *loved*, has something of familiarity in it beyond *ἠγάπα*; it is undoubtedly used here because the matter in question is a simple indication of a fact, without any particular emphasis, Jesus Himself being absent.—The imperfect *ἤρχοντο*, *they were coming, repairing*, is pictorial; comp. iv. 30. This imperfect of continuance reflects the feeling of inexpressible expectation which caused the hearts of the disciples to beat during the running to the sepulchre.

Vv. 4–7. “*And they ran both together; and the other disciple<sup>1</sup> ran more quickly than Peter, and he came first to the sepulchre; 5, and, stooping down, he sees the linen cloths<sup>2</sup> lying on the ground;<sup>3</sup> yet he did not enter in. 6. Simon Peter, following him, comes, and he entered into the sepulchre; and he beholds the linen cloths lying on the ground,<sup>3</sup> 7, and the napkin, which had been placed upon his head, not lying with the other linen cloths, but rolled up and lying in a place by itself.*”—John, being younger and more agile, arrives first. But his emotion is so strong that he timidly stops at the entrance to the sepulchre, after having looked in. Peter, of a more masculine and practical character, resolutely enters. These details are so natural, and so harmonious with the personality of the two disciples, that they bear in themselves the seal of their authenticity. They recall those of ch. i.—The present *he sees* (ver. 5) is contrasted with the aorist *came* (ver. 4); the same contrast occurs again between the verbs *he entered* and *he beholds* (ver. 6). This difference springs from the contrast between the moment of arrival or of entrance and the continuance of the examination which follows or precedes. The word *θεωρεῖ*, *beholds*, unites in one the observation of the fact and the reflection on the fact. These linen cloths spread out did not suggest a removal; for the body would not have been carried away completely naked. The napkin, especially, rolled up and laid aside carefully, attested, not a precipitate removal, but a calm awakening. Here was what might suggest reflection to the two disciples.

Vv. 8–10. “*Then entered in also the other disciple who had first come to the sepulchre; and he saw and believed. 9. For they did not yet<sup>4</sup> understand the Scripture which says that he should rise from the dead. 10. Then the disciples returned to their own homes.*”—The singular verbs *he saw* and *he believed* are remarkable. Until this point two disciples had been spoken of, and in the following verse the story joins them again: *They did not understand*. These two verbs in the singular, which separate the plural verbs, cannot have been placed here unintentionally: the author evidently wishes to speak of an experience which is peculiar to himself. He cannot testify for the other disciple; but he can do so for himself. This must, indeed, have been one of the most ineffaceable moments of his life. He initiates us into

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$  omits *καὶ ὁ ἄλλος μαθητὴς* (*and the other disciple*).

<sup>2</sup> A X Syr. Cop. Sah. place *ἄθροια* before *κειμένα*.

<sup>3</sup>  $\aleph$  omits the end of ver. 5 after *οὐ* and the whole of ver. 6 (a confounding of the two  $\tau$ .  $\sigma$ . *κειμένα*).

<sup>4</sup>  $\aleph$   $\Gamma$   $\tau$   $\alpha$   $\iota$   $\nu$  : *οὐκ ᾔδει* (*he did not understand*).

an incomparable personal reminiscence, into the way by which he reached the belief in the resurrection, in the first place, and then, through this, the perfect faith in Christ as Messiah and Son of God. The idea of *believing*, indeed, does not refer, as some have thought, to the contents of the report of Mary Magdalene: "they have taken Him away." This fact was the object of sight, not of faith. By examining the condition of the tomb and the position of the linen cloths, the disciple comes to the conviction that it is Jesus Himself who has done this; consequently, that He is alive. We should have expected that he would make mention at this time of a special appearance of the Lord to His beloved disciple: He did appear, indeed, to Peter and James. But no; everything in the narrative is sober: *he saw and believed*. There was no need of anything more. Nevertheless, we must not find here an eulogy which John would bestow upon himself and which would resemble a boast. The following verse sufficiently shows the spirit of humility which prevails in this narrative. These words must be paraphrased in this sense: "He saw and believed *at length*." John is himself astonished at the state of ignorance in which he, as well as Peter, had remained until this moment with regard to the scriptural prophecies foretelling the resurrection of the Messiah. He says *ἠδυσσαν*, which is an imperfect in sense: "*They were not understanding*." Even then they did not yet grasp the meaning of the prophecies announcing the death and resurrection of the Messiah. Only after the resurrection did they open their eyes to these prophetic revelations (Ps. xvi. 10, Is. liii. 10, etc.; comp. Luke xxiv. 25-27 and 45).—As to Peter, we do not know whether the view of the condition of the sepulchre brought him also to faith. John does not say this; for the question here is of an inward personal fact. Perhaps there was needed, in order that this result might be fully secured in the case of Peter, the appearance of the Lord which was granted to this disciple on this same day (Luke xxiv. 34, 1 Cor. xv. 5).—The parallel, Luke xxiv. 12, is very probably only a gloss drawn up by means of John's narrative.—This whole passage, relating to the disciple whom Jesus loved and to Peter, presents one of the most striking features of the autobiographical character of our Gospel.

The Tübingen school, followed by *Strauss* and *Renan*, think that this narrative is a fiction designed to raise John to the level of Peter. The author, a disciple of John, systematically endeavored to make his master the equal of Peter. What! By ascribing to him more agile limbs, yet also, on the other hand, less energy and courage! Or by ascribing to him faith of a more spiritual character, in opposition to the carnal character of the Christianity of Peter, and consequently of the Twelve? But John accuses himself also of a carnal want of understanding with regard to the prophecies. All this Machiavellism attributed to the evangelist vanishes away at the simple and unprejudiced reading of this story, which is so simple and so dramatic.

*Colani* sees in these words of ver. 9: "*They did not yet understand the Scripture*," a contradiction as related to the predictions of the resurrection which are placed in the mouth of Jesus by the Synoptics. If these predictions were real, the evangelist ought rather to have said: "They did not yet understand

the predictions of Jesus."<sup>1</sup> But if there was needed only the sight of the linen cloths and the napkin to determine the faith in the heart of the disciple, this was certainly due to the promises of Jesus; they had not sufficed to make him believe in the resurrection of the *body* of Jesus, because he applied them undoubtedly to His glorious return from heaven; but it was they which made this external circumstance sufficient to bring John to faith. John was not obliged to mention this fact, since of the prophecies of Jesus respecting His resurrection he had quoted only the enigmatical saying in ii. 19.

## 2. Vv. 11-18.

Mary Magdalene has just been for the two chief disciples the messenger announcing the empty sepulchre; she receives the first manifestation of the Lord, and becomes for all the messenger of the resurrection.

Vv. 11-13. "*But Mary was standing near the sepulchre,*<sup>2</sup> *weeping at the entrance; 12, and, as she wept, she stooped down to look into the sepulchre; and she sees two angels,*<sup>3</sup> *clothed in white, sitting, one at the head and the other at the feet, in the place where the body of Jesus had lain; 13, and they say to her, Woman, why weepest thou? She says to them, Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him.*"—Peter and John withdraw, one of them at least already believing; Mary remains and weeps, and as one does when vainly seeking for a precious object, she looks ever anew at the place where it seems to her that He should be. There is nothing to prevent our taking the present participle *καθεζομένης*, *sitting*, in its strictly grammatical sense. She perceives the two angels at the moment of their appearance. This fact does not contradict the earlier appearance of an angel to the women who had first visited the tomb. The angels are not immovable and visible after the manner of stone statues.—Mary answers the question of the celestial visitors as simply as if she had been conversing with human beings, so completely is she preoccupied with a single idea: to recover her Master. Who could have invented this feature of the story? *Weiss*, without any reason, sees here a reminiscence of the appearance of the angel to the women, which has slipped into the wrong place.

Vv. 14-16. "*After having spoken thus, she turned herself back; and she sees Jesus standing there, but without knowing that it was Jesus. 15. Jesus says to her, Woman, why weepest thou? Whom seekest thou? She, supposing that he was the gardener, says to him: Sir, if thou hast borne<sup>4</sup> him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away. 16. Jesus says to her, Mary! She, turning herself, says to him, in Hebrew,<sup>5</sup> *Rabboni*, which means, *Master*.*"—Mary, after having stooped down into the sepulchre, raises herself and turns about, as if to seek for Him whom she is asking for. Perhaps she heard some noise behind her. The supposition of Mary has been

<sup>1</sup> *Jésus-Christ et les croyances messianiques de son temps*, p. 112.

<sup>2</sup> Instead of *προς το μνημειον*, A B E G H L M Δ Δ 60 Mm. read *προς τω μνημειω*, N εν τω μνημειω (rejecting εξω with A Italicque Syr.).

<sup>3</sup> N omits *δυο* (*two*) before *αγγελους*.

<sup>4</sup> N: *ει συ ει ο βαστασας*.

<sup>5</sup> N B D L O X Δ Π 7 Mm. Italicque Syr. Cop. read after *αυτω*, *εβραιστι* (*in Hebrew*), which T. R. omits with 9 Mjj.

explained by the garment which Jesus wore. But she might easily suppose that the one who was there at that early morning hour and who thus interrogated her was the gardener. And as to garments, workmen were not often clothed except with a girdle (xxi. 7).—The difficulty of recognizing Jesus arose from two causes; notwithstanding the identity of the body of Jesus, there was wrought a change in His whole person by His passing into a new life; He appeared ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ, says Mark (xvi. 12). His disciples, in seeing Him again, experienced something like what occurs in us when we meet a friend after a long separation; we need more or less length of time in order to recognize him; then, all at once, the simplest manifestation is enough to make the bandage fall from our eyes. But there was also an internal cause. Mary's want of faith in the promises of Jesus caused the idea of His return to life to be absolutely foreign to her present thought.—Jesus, as always, adapts His action to the needs of the soul which suffers and loves. What is most personal in human manifestations is the sound of the voice; it is by this means that Jesus makes Himself known to her. The tone which this name of Mary takes in His mouth expresses all that which she is for Him, all that which He is for her.—It follows from the word στραφείσα, *having turned about*, that she had turned again towards the tomb. For she was agitated, and was searching on one side, then on the other. And now, at the sound of this well-known voice, trembling even to the depths of her soul, she in turn puts all her being into the cry: *Master!* and throws herself at His feet, seeking to clasp them, as is shown by ver. 17.—*Rabbouni*, which is found only here and Mark x. 51, is a form of the word *Rabban*. The *ν* is either the *ν* paragoric or the suffix *my*. In the second case, it may gradually have lost its signification, which explains why the evangelist does not translate it. The word ἐβραϊστί, in *Hebrew*, which is read in the most ancient Mss., is suspicious; it may be defended, however, by recalling to mind how the word *rabbouni* was strange to the ears of the Greek readers of the Gospel.

Vv. 17, 18. “*Jesus says to her: Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father;¹ but go to my brethren¹ and say to them,² I ascend to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God. 18. Mary Magdalene comes to the disciples and tells³ them that she has seen the Lord and that he has said these words to her.*”—As Mary extends her arms towards Him, Jesus seems to put Himself on His guard; what is His thought? Could He fear this touch, which might have something painful in it for Him, either because of His wounds, which were scarcely cicatrized (*Paulus*), or by reason of the delicate nature of His body, in a sense freshly born (*Schleiermacher, Olshausen*)? As *Reuss* says, one cites such explanations only as a remembrance. Or might this touching seem contrary to the dignity of His body henceforth made divine (*Chrysostom, Erasmus*)? This explanation is incompatible with the invitation which He gives to Thomas to touch Him; comp. also Luke xxiv. 39.—*Lücke* thought of the use of the verb ἀπτεσθαι in the phrase to

¹ *Σ Β Δ* It<sup>niq</sup> reject μου after πατέρα, and *Σ* ascend.  
*Δ* reject it after αδελφους.

³ *Σ Α Β Ι Χ*: αγγελουσα for απαγγελουσα.

² *Σ* adds ιδου (*behold*) before αναβαινω (*I*

*touch the knees*, for *to worship*, *to supplicate*, in Homer. The attempt has even been made to unite these words, in this sense, to what follows: "I am not yet glorified; it is not yet, therefore, the time to worship me." But *ἀπτεσθαι* alone never has this meaning, and Jesus accepts a few days afterwards the adoration of Thomas.—It has been supposed (*Meyer*, *Bäumlein*) that Jesus wishes to remove a feeling of anxiety from the heart of Mary, who is trying to assure herself of the reality of what she sees. But in that case *ψηλαφᾶν* would rather be the proper word than *ἀπτεσθαι*. Or the meaning *to hold back* has been given to the word *to touch*. "Do not stop to hold me as if I were ready to escape thee, but go to my brethren" (*Neander*). But with this meaning, it would have been *κρατεῖν* (*to lay hold of*). This reason excludes also the explanation of *Baur*: "Do not hold me: for it is necessary that I ascend to my Father, to whom I have not yet returned."—The *ἀπτεσθαι*, the *touching*, which Jesus forbids is not that of anxiety, but that of joy (2 Cor. vi. 17, Col. ii. 21): "Clasp not my feet; I have not come to renew the old earthly relations. The true *seeing again* which I have promised you is not this. To return in a real and permanent way, it must be that I shall have first ascended. That time has not yet come." Or, as *Steinmeyer* says, "it is, indeed, rather for leave-taking that I have come." The disciples imagined that the death of Jesus was the *return to the Father* of which He had spoken to them, and His reappearance (xiii. 1) seemed to them the beginning of His permanent abiding with them. They confounded His death with the ascension, and the promised return with the Parousia. But Jesus declares to them by this message of Mary that *He is not yet ascended*, and that it is only now that *He is going to ascend*. Instead of enjoying this moment of possession, therefore, as if Jesus were really restored to her, Mary must rise and go to tell the disciples what is taking place. Jesus does not say *ἀνέβην* (the aorist), but *ἀναβέβηκα* (the perfect); He denies that He is already in the state of one who has done the act of ascending and who can contract with His own the higher relation in which they will possess Him again.—"But go" is opposed to the act of staying to enjoy. The message with which Jesus charges her for His disciples consequently signifies: "I am not yet in my state of glory; but as soon as I shall be in it, I will give you a share in it, and then nothing shall any longer interpose between you and me." Hence the expressions: "*my brethren*" and "*my Father and your Father*." There is here a foretaste, as it were, of the future communion. These terms set forth the indissoluble solidarity which will unite them to Him in the glorious state into which He now enters. He had not until now called them *His brethren*; the same expression is found again in Matt. xxviii. 10. It contains more than *Weiss* thinks, when he sees in it only the idea that His exaltation will not alter His fraternal relation to them. No more do I think that Jesus wishes to bring out thereby the community of action which will unite them (*Steinmeyer*, *Keil*). He calls them *His brethren* as sharing in the divine adoption which He has acquired for them; they will enjoy with Him filial communion with God Himself. The words: "*my Father and your Father*," are the explanation of it. On this expression: *my brethren*, comp. Rom. viii. 29.—In the

name of *Father* there is filial intimacy ; in that of *God*, complete dependence, and this for the disciples as for Jesus Himself.—But within this equality so glorious for the believers, there remains an ineffaceable difference. Jesus does not and cannot say *our Father, our God*, because God is not their Father, their God, in the same sense in which He is His Father and His God.—The present *ἀναβαίνω, I ascend*, has been variously explained : either as designating the certain and near fact, like the presents : *I go to the Father* (*ὑπάγω, πορεύομαι*) in the previous discourses, or as going so far as even to identify the day of the resurrection with that of the ascension (*Baur, Keim*) ; whence a contradiction between John and the Synoptics. The first sense is impossible ; for the opposition : “I am not yet ascended, . . . but I ascend,” forces us to give to the present its strict meaning. The second is not any more admissible, since this appearance has no characteristic which distinguishes it from the following ones, which would necessarily be the case if the ascension, the complete glorification, separated them. The : *I ascend*, must designate thus a present elevation of position which is not yet the ascension. We cannot, whatever *Weiss* may say, escape the idea of a progressive exaltation during the days which separated the resurrection from the ascension—an exaltation to which the gradual transformation of the body of Jesus, which appears clearly from everything that follows, corresponds. On the one hand, *He is no longer with the disciples*, living with them the earthly existence (Luke xxiv. 44) ; on the other, He is also not yet in the state of glorification with the Father. It is a state of bodily and spiritual transition exactly denoted by the word *I ascend*.

By this message Jesus desires to raise the eyes of Mary and of His disciples from the imperfect joy of this momentary seeing Him again, which is only a means, to the expectation of the permanent spiritual communion, which is the end, but which must be preceded by His return to the Father (xiv: 12, 19, xvi. 7, 16). This warning applies to all the visits which shall follow, and is designed to comfort His followers for the sudden disappearances which shall put an end to them.—The present, *she comes* (ver. 18), expresses in all its vividness the surprise produced in the disciples by this arrival and this message.

We have said that the appearance to the women related by Matthew (xxviii. 9, 10) seems to us to be identical with that which John has just described with more detail. And indeed it is enough to convince us of this, if we compare the words : “Touch me not,” and, “Go, and say to my brethren,” with these : “*They held him by the feet,*” and : “*Go, and say to my brethren.*” Some modern critics, also identifying the two scenes, have supposed that John’s narrative is rather a poetic amplification of the short story of Matthew, formed by means of those of Mark and Luke.<sup>1</sup> But how is it not seen that the story of Matthew is a vague traditional summary, while John’s description reproduces the real scene in all its primitive freshness and distinctness ?

<sup>1</sup> *Keim*, for example (III. p. 558) : “The evangelist of Christian mysticism borrows from Matthew the visit of Mary Magdalene to the sepulchre and the message to the disciples.”

II.—*The First Appearance to the Disciples* : vv. 19–23.

The risen Lord advances by degrees in His manifestation of Himself. The appearance of Jesus to Mary Magdalene, prepared for by that of the angels, prepares in its turn, by the message entrusted to Mary for the disciples, for His appearance in the midst of them. Two particular manifestations of the Risen One took place before this one in the course of that day—the appearance to the two disciples of Emmaus and that which was granted to Peter (Luke xxiv. 13–32, 34, Mark xvi. 12, 13). That in the evening to all the disciples, which is described in what follows, is evidently identical with that which Luke (xxiv. 36 ff.) and Mark (xvi. 14) relate. This appearance had as its essential aim to establish in them faith in the resurrection, and thereby to strengthen their faith in Him ; it was to serve also as a preparation for their apostolic mission.

Vv. 19, 20. “*The evening having come, therefore, on this same first day of the week, the doors of the place where the disciples were<sup>1</sup> being shut because of the fear which they had of the Jews, Jesus came and stood in the midst of them and says to them, Peace be to you!* 20. *And, after he had said this, he showed them his hands and his side.<sup>2</sup> The disciples therefore rejoiced when they saw the Lord.*”—The plural *θύρων* (*the doors*) denotes a two-leaved door. The words : “*because of the fear,*” refer to the fact of the closing which is mentioned again in ver. 26, but without the explanation here given.—It has been thought that this external fact was designed only to characterize the moral state of the disciples (*Lücke*), and that, on the arrival of Jesus, the gates were quite naturally opened (*Schleiermacher*). *Strauss*, on the other hand, is so indignant at this explanation, that he goes even so far as to declare that a real hardening of mind against the meaning of the gospel text is necessary in order to maintain it. *Calvin* and *de Pressensé* suppose that the doors opened miraculously of themselves (comp. Acts xii. 10). But the term *ἔστη*, *he stood*, indicates less an entrance than a sudden appearance, and in ver. 26, where the fact of the doors being closed is mentioned again, it is put in connection, not with the fear of the apostles, but with the mode of the appearance itself. I think, therefore, with *Weiss*, *Keil*, etc., that the sudden presence of Jesus in the midst of the disciples cannot be explained except by the fact that the body of Jesus was already subjected to the power of the spirit. In truth, this body was still that which had served Him as an organ during His life (ver. 20) ; but, as already before His death this body obeyed the force of the will (vi. 16–21), so now, through the transformation of the resurrection, it had approached still nearer to the condition of the glorified and spiritual body (1 Cor. xv. 44). The expression *ἔστη* is found again in the narrative of Luke (xxiv. 37) ; there it is in evident connection with the feeling of terror which the disciples at first experience and with the supposition that it is a *spirit* ; for He was present when no one had seen Him

<sup>1</sup> T. R. adds *συνήγαμενοι* (*assembled*) which is omitted in  $\aleph$  A B D I A 6 Mun. It<sup>sup</sup> Syr.

<sup>2</sup> T. R. with 12 Mjj. (E G H etc.) Syr. : *εδ.*

αυτοις τας χειρας και την πλευραν αυτου.  $\aleph$  D I : *εδ. τας χειρας και την πλευραν αυτοις.* A B : *εδ. και τας χειρας και την πλευραν αυτοις.*

enter. With this manner of appearing His sudden disappearances correspond (Luke xxiv. 31 : ἄφαντος ἐγένετο).

The salutation of Jesus is the same in Luke and in John : *Peace be to you!* Weiss sees here only the ordinary Jewish salutation ; but why, in that case, repeat it twice (ver. 21)? Evidently Jesus makes this formula the vehicle of a new and more elevated thought. He invites His disciples to open their heart to the peace of reconciliation which He brings to them in rising from the dead. "*Having come,*" says Paul (Eph. ii. 17), "*he preached peace.*"—Ver. 20. The words : *And having said this,* establish a relation between the wish of ver. 19 and the act related in ver. 20. To convince them of the reality of His appearance was to give them the proof of the divine good-will which restored to them their Master, to change their terror into peace and even into joy.—The fact that He does not show them His feet cannot prove anything in favor of the opinion that on the cross the feet had not been nailed. The pierced hands and side were enough to prove His identity. Besides, it follows from Luke xxiv. 40 that this detail has merely been omitted by John.

Vv. 21-23. "*Jesus<sup>1</sup> therefore said to them again, Peace be to you! As the Father has sent me, even so I send<sup>2</sup> you. 22. And, having said this, he breathed on them and says to them, Receive [the] Holy Spirit. 23. Whosoever<sup>3</sup> sins you remit, they are remitted<sup>4</sup> to them; whosoever sins you retain, they are retained.*"—It is no longer only as to believers that Jesus desires to give them peace ; it is in view of their future vocation. Peace is the foundation of the apostleship ; hence the repetition of the prayer : *Peace be to you!* This message of reconciliation, which Jesus brings to them, they will have the task of preaching to the world (2 Cor. v. 20). Jesus first confers on them the office (ver. 21 b) ; then He communicates to them the *gift*, in the measure in which He can do so in His present position (ver. 22) ; finally, He reveals to them the wonderful greatness of this task (ver. 23).

There is properly only *one* mission from heaven to earth : it is that of Jesus. He is *the apostle* (Heb. iii. 1). That of the disciples is included in His, and will finally realize it for the world. Hence it comes to pass that Jesus, when speaking of Himself, employs the more official term ἀπέσταλκε : it is an *embassy* ; while, in passing to them, He uses the more simple term πέμπω : it is a *sending*.

Ver. 22. The *endowment* in view of this sending.—As there is properly only one mission, there is also only one *force* for fulfilling it—that of Jesus, which He communicates through His Spirit.—The words : *Having said this,* serve, like ver. 20, to connect the following act with the preceding words. There are two extreme opinions as to the value of the act described in this verse. According to *Baur*, *Hilgenfeld* and *Keim*, the evangelist transfers to this day Pentecost as well as the ascension (ver. 17). But the : *I ascend* of

<sup>1</sup> T. R. reads Ἰησοῦς, before παλιν, with 13 Mj. (A B I etc.) ; this word is omitted by N D L O X I<sup>tr</sup> etc. Vulg. Cop.

<sup>2</sup> Instead of πέμπω, N : πέμφω (*I will send*) ; D L O : ἀποστέλλω.

<sup>3</sup> Instead of τινων, B It<sup>all</sup> q : τινος.

<sup>4</sup> T. R. reads αφιενται with 11 Mj. (E G I etc.) ; A D L O X : αφεωνται ; N Syr. : αφεθησεται (*shall be remitted*).

ver. 17 could not have been accomplished in the course of this day ; for ver. 20 proves that Jesus did not yet have His glorified body. But it is from the Father that He is to send the Spirit (vii. 39, xvi. 7). Moreover, the absence of the article before πνεῦμα ἁγίου, *Holy Spirit*, shows that the question here is not yet of the sending of the Paraclete promised in chs. xiv.—xvi. Hence others—*Chrysostom*, *Grotius*, *Tholuck*—have concluded that there was a purely symbolic act here, a sensible pledge of the future sending of the Spirit. But this sense is incompatible with the imperative λάβετε, *receive!* *You shall receive* would be necessary. This expression implies a present communication. The question here is neither of a simple promise nor of the full outpouring of the Spirit. Raised Himself to a stage of higher life, Jesus raises them, as far as He can do so, to His new position. He associates them in His state as raised from the dead, just as later, through Pentecost, He will make them participate in His state as one glorified. He communicates to them the peace of adoption and the understanding of the Scriptures (Luke xxiv. 45); He puts their will in unison with His own, that they may be prepared for the common work (ver. 21). Some commentators—*Reuss*, for example—see here an allusion to Gen. ii. 7 : “*The Lord breathed into the nostrils (of man) a breath of life.*” But the thought of Jesus seems to me to refer rather to the future than to the past. This preparatory communication will necessarily make them understand, when the wind of the Spirit shall blow, that this wind is nothing else than the personal breath of their invisible Master.

Ver. 23. The new work which is intrusted to them is here displayed in all its *greatness*; the matter in question is nothing less than giving or refusing salvation to every human being; to open and close heaven—this is their task. The old covenant had a provisional pardon and a revocable rejection. With the coming of the Holy Spirit, the world enters into the domain of unchangeable realities. This power of pardoning sins (Matt. ix. 6) or of retaining them (John ix. 41, xv. 22, 24), which the Son of man had exercised, will be theirs for the future by virtue of His Spirit who will accompany them.—The expressions which Jesus employs indicate more than an *offer* of pardon or a *threatening* of condemnation, more even than a *declaration* of salvation or of perdition by means of the preaching of the Gospel. Jesus speaks of a word which is accompanied by efficacy, either for taking away the guilt from the guilty or for binding it eternally to his person. He who is truly the organ of the Spirit (ver. 21) does not merely say : “*Thou art saved*”—he saves by his word—or “*Thou art condemned*”—he really condemns, and this because, at the moment when he pronounces these words by means of the Spirit, God ratifies them. The present ἀφίενται (literally, *are pardoned*) indicates a present effect; God pardons these sins at the very moment. The perfect ἀφένονται, which some Mjj. read, would signify : “*are and remain pardoned.*” This perfect was probably introduced for the sake of the symmetry of the clause with the following (κεκράτηνται). The copyists did not understand that in the first there is a question of a present momentary *fact*, the passage from the state of condemnation to the state of grace, while the second relates to a *state* which continues, the condemnation established forever.

The order of the two propositions indicates that the first of the two results is the true aim of the mission, and that the second does not come to its realization except in the cases where the first has failed.—It does not seem to me that anything gives us the right to see here a special power conferred on the apostles as such. The question is not of right, but of force. It is the *πνεῦμα* which is its principle. I do not see any reason, therefore, to apply this prerogative to the apostles alone, as *Keil* would have it. *The disciples* of vv. 18, 19 are certainly all believers taken together; the two from Emmaus were present, and many others, not apostles, with them, according to Luke xxiv. 33. And why should the gift of the Spirit be restricted to the apostles? They certainly have a special *authority*. But the forces of the Spirit are common to all believers. *Weiss* supposes that the prerogative here conferred by Jesus is no other than that of distinguishing between venial sins and mortal sins (1 John v. 16). But this application is much too special and foreign to the context. Besides, the similar promise made to Peter, Matt. xvi. 19, had already been extended, in a certain measure, to the whole Church, Matt. xviii. 18.

### III.—*The Second Appearance to the Disciples (Thomas):* vv. 24-29.

A last principle of unbelief still remained in the circle of the Twelve. It is extirpated, and the development of faith reaches its limit in all the future witnesses for Christ.

Vv. 24, 25. “*But Thomas, one of the Twelve, he who was called Didymus, was not with them when Jesus came. 25. The other disciples therefore<sup>1</sup> said to him, We have seen the Lord; but he said to them: Unless I see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print<sup>2</sup> of the nails, and put my hand into his side, I will not believe.*”—On *δίδυμος, twin*, see xi. 16. We have learned to know Thomas through xi. 16 and xiv. 5; the impression produced on him by the death of his Master must have been that of the most profound discouragement: “I told Him so;” this is what he, no doubt, repeated to himself. His absence on the first day could not be without relation to this bitter feeling. This is confirmed by the manner in which he receives the testimony of his brethren. There is tenacity even in the form of his words, and especially in the repetition of the same terms. Here is what makes us doubt about the reading *τόπον, the place*, instead of the second *τύπον, the print*. This reading, adopted by *Tischendorf, Weiss, Keil, etc.*, is not only feebly supported, but it takes away from the denial of the disciple this marked character of obstinacy. On the other hand, it must be acknowledged that the second *τύπος* may easily have been substituted for *τόπος* under the influence of the preceding one. If Thomas does not speak of Jesus’ feet, it is ridiculous to conclude from this fact, with some interpreters, that the feet had not been nailed.

Vv. 26, 27. “*Eight days afterwards, his disciples were assembled again in*

<sup>1</sup> **Σ** adds *οὐν* after *οτε* and rejects it in ver. 25 after *ελεγον* (when therefore Jesus came, they said to him).

<sup>2</sup> **A I H** *plerique* Vulg. Orig. read *τοπον* (the place) instead of *τυπον*, and **Σ** *εις την χειραν* (sic) *αυτου*, instead of *εις τον τοπον των ηλων* (unless I put my finger into his hand and put my hand into his side).

the room; and Thomas was with them. Jesus comes, the doors being shut, and he stood in the midst of them, and said: Peace be to you! 27. Then he says to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and see my hands, and reach hither thy hand, and put it into my side, and become not unbelieving, but believing."—Jesus had bidden the disciples, through the women, to return to Galilee (Matt. xxviii. 7, Mark xvi. 7). How does it happen that they were still in Judea eight days after the resurrection? Are we not allowed to suppose that what detained them was the fear of abandoning Thomas and of losing him, if they left him behind in the condition of mind in which he was?—In His salutation Jesus includes this disciple also; it is even to him that He specially addresses it; for he is the only one who does not yet enjoy the peace which faith gives.—The almost literal reproduction of the rash words of Thomas is designed to make him blush at the grossness of such a demand. It may be supposed, with Weiss, that the term βάλλειν εἰς, to put into, means simply to stretch out the hand under the garment of Jesus, in order to touch the scar.—By the expression: *Become not*, Jesus makes him feel in what a critical position he actually is, at this point where the two routes separate: that of decided unbelief and that of perfect faith. A single point of truth, a single fact of the history of salvation, which one obstinately refuses to accept, may become the starting-point for complete unbelief, as also the victory gained over unbelief, with regard to this single point, may lead to perfect faith.

Vv. 28, 29. "*Thomas answered* and said to him, *My Lord and my God!* 29. *Jesus says to him,*<sup>2</sup> *Because thou hast seen me,*<sup>3</sup> *thou hast believed. Blessed are they who, without having seen, have believed.*"—What produces so profound an impression upon Thomas is not only the reality of the resurrection, which he touches with his hands, it is also the omniscience of the Lord, which the latter proves by repeating to him, just as they were, the words which he thought he had uttered in His absence. This scene recalls that of Nathanael (ch. i.). Just as in the case of the latter, the light shines suddenly, with an irresistible brightness, even into the depths of the soul of Thomas; and by one of those frequent reactions in the moral life, he rises by a single bound from the lowest degree of faith to the highest, and proclaims the divinity of his Master in a more categorical expression than all those which had ever come forth from the lips of any of his fellow-apostles. The last becomes in a moment the first, and the faith of the apostles attains at length, in the person of Thomas, to the whole height of the divine reality formulated in the first words of the Prologue. It is in vain that *Theodore of Mopsuestia*, the Socinians and others have wished to apply to God, not to Jesus, Thomas' cry of adoration, by making it either an expression of praise, or an exclamation in honor of God. It should not be, in that case, εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "He said to Him;" besides, the term *my Lord* can only refer to Jesus. The monotheism of Thomas is made an objection. But it is precisely because this disciple understands

<sup>1</sup> 7 Mjj. (Σ B C D G etc.) Ἰππῆρια, reject καὶ (and) before ἀπεκρίθη (answered).

<sup>2</sup> Instead of λέγει, Σ: εἶπεν δε.

<sup>3</sup> All the Mjj. 150 Mnn. It. Syr., after εὐρακάς με, reject Θωμά (Thomas), which T. R. reads with some Mnn.—Σ reads καὶ (also) after με.

that he bears towards Jesus henceforth a feeling which passes beyond what can be accorded to a creature, that he is forced, even by his monotheism, to place this being in the heart of Deity.—The repetition of the article and that of the pronoun *μου* give to these words a peculiar solemnity (*Weiss*).

Ver. 29. In itself, this address of the disciple would not have a decisive value. It might be an exaggeration of feeling. But what gives it an absolute importance is the manner in which Jesus receives it. The Lord does not check this outbreak of feeling, like the angel of the Apocalypse, who says to John : “ *Worship God !*” He answers, on the contrary : “ *Thou hast believed,*” and thus accepts the expression by which Thomas has proclaimed His divinity. In an article by *Lien* (May, 1869), it is objected that this approving answer of Jesus may refer not to the expression : *My God*, but to the belief of Thomas in the fact of the resurrection. But if Jesus had approved of the exclamation of the disciple only in part, He would have found the means of removing the alloy, while preserving the pure gold.—The perfect *πεπίστευκας, thou hast believed*, signifies : “ *Thou art henceforth in possession of faith.*” This verb might also be taken in an interrogative sense. For *Meyer* observes, not without reason, that there is in the words : *because thou hast seen*, a shade of reproach which accords well with this sense.—In the last words Jesus points out the entirely new character of the era which is beginning, that of a faith which should be contented with testimony, without claiming to be founded on sight, as that of Thomas had done.—This saying closes the history of the development of faith in the apostles, and gives a glimpse of the new phase which is about to begin—that of the faith of the Church resting upon the apostolic testimony. *Baur* thinks that Jesus here opposes to faith in *external facts* that which has its contents only in itself, in the *idea* of which the believer is henceforth fully conscious. But vv. 30 and 31 express a thought directly opposite to this. So *Baur* has declared them to be interpolated, without the least proof. The contrast which Jesus points out is altogether different : it is that of a carnal faith, which in order to accept a miracle wishes absolutely to *see* it, and a faith of a moral nature, which accepts the divine fact on the foundation of a *testimony* which is worthy of confidence. It was granted to Thomas to be saved on the former path ; but from this time forward it will be necessary to content oneself with the second. Otherwise faith would be no longer possible in the world except on condition of miracles renewed unceasingly and celestial appearances repeating themselves for every individual. This is not to be the course of the divine work on earth.—The aorist participle *ιδόντες*, properly : *who shall have seen*, indicates an anterior act with relation to faith, and the aorist participle *πιστεῖσαντες*, *who have believed*, is spoken from the standpoint of the development of the Church regarded as consummated.

This answer of Jesus to Thomas is the normal close of the fourth Gospel. It indicates the limit of development of the apostolic faith, and the starting-point of the new era which is to succeed it on the earth. The apostolic faith, as it has just risen to the full height of its object, will be able henceforth to re-echo throughout the world by means of the testimony of the chosen messengers, so as incessantly to reproduce itself.

## ON THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST.

*Strauss* has said, in speaking of the resurrection of Jesus :<sup>1</sup> "Here is the decisive point, where the naturalistic view must retract all its previous assertions or succeed in explaining the belief in the resurrection without bringing in a miraculous fact." And *Strauss* is right. The question here is of a miracle *sui generis*, of the miracle properly so called. The usual expedients for explaining the miracles of Jesus, "the hidden forces of spontaneity," the mysterious influence exerted upon the nerves "by the contact of an exquisite person"—all this has no longer any application here ; for no other human being co-operated in the resurrection of Jesus, if it took place. If Jesus really came forth alive from the tomb after His crucifixion, there is nothing left but to say with St. Peter : *God has raised up Jesus.*

It is said : Such a fact would overthrow the laws of nature. But what if it were, on the contrary, the law of nature, when thoroughly understood, which required this fact? Death is the wages of sin. If Jesus lived here below as innocent and pure, if He lived in God and *of God*, as He Himself says in John vi. 57, life must be the crown of this unique conqueror. No doubt He may have given Himself up voluntarily to death to fulfil the law which condemns sinful humanity ; but might not this stroke of death, affecting a nature perfectly sound, morally and physically, meet in it exceptional forces capable of reacting victoriously against all the powers of dissolution? As necessarily as a life of sin ends in death, so necessarily does perfect holiness end in life, and consequently, if there has been death, in the resurrection. Natural law, therefore, far from being contrary to this fact, is the thing which requires it.

But if this fact is rational, when once the perfect holiness of Jesus is admitted, is it possible? To deny that it is, would be to affirm an irreducible dualism between *being* and *virtue*. It would be to deny monotheism. The divine will is the basis of being, and the essence of this will is to move towards the good. In creating being it has therefore reserved to itself the means of realizing the good in all the forms of existence and of causing the absolute sovereignty of holiness to be triumphant in the being. This is all that we can determine *a priori* from the theistic standpoint. "Every historian," says *Strauss*, "should possess philosophy enough to be able to deny the miracle here as well as elsewhere." Every true historian, we will answer, should have philosophy enough, above all, to let the word yield to the facts, here as elsewhere.

Let us, in the first place, study the four, or rather the five, narratives of the appearances of the Risen One.

I.—*The Narratives.*

*John* mentions three appearances of Jesus (to Mary Magdalene, the Twelve, Thomas), all three in Judea and in the week which followed the resurrection.—Is this to say that the author did not know of a larger number? The twenty-first chapter, which proceeds from him directly or indirectly, proves the contrary. For this chapter mentions a new one which took place in Galilee. That to Thomas closes the Gospel properly so called, for the reasons which belong to the plan and aim of the work (see on xx. 28, 29).

*Matthew* relates two appearances : that to the women in Judea, which seems

<sup>1</sup> *Das Leben Jesu*, 1864, p. 288.

to be only a generalized double of the appearance to Mary Magdalene (in John), and that to the Eleven on the mountain where He had appointed for them a meeting-place. It was in the latter that Christ made known to the apostles His elevation to the Messianic royalty, to the sovereignty over all things. This is the reason why it closes the first Gospel, which is designed to demonstrate the Messianic dignity of Jesus, and in the view of the author serves to sum up all the others. This took place in Galilee, like that of the twenty-first chapter of John.

If we set aside the unauthentic end of *Mark*, we find in this Gospel only the *promise* of an appearance to the believers in Galilee. We are ignorant of what the true conclusion of this work must have contained. What we now possess, composed from John and Luke, mentions the appearance to Mary Magdalene (John) and those to the two from Emmaus and to the disciples on the evening of the day of the resurrection (Luke).

*Luke* mentions three appearances: that on the road to Emmaus, that to Peter, that to the disciples on the evening of the first day; all three in Judea and on the very day of the resurrection. It would be difficult to believe that he did not know of others, since he had labored for the evangelization of the Gentile world with St. Paul, who, as we are about to see, mentions several others. Luke himself, in Acts i. 3, speaks of *forty days* during which Jesus showed Himself alive to the apostles. He simply desired, therefore, to report the first appearances which served to establish in the hearts of the apostles the belief in the fact of the resurrection.

As for *Paul*, he enumerates in 1 Cor. xv. 3 ff., as facts appertaining to the apostolic tradition which he has himself received, first the appearances to Peter and to the Twelve which immediately followed the resurrection; then a later appearance to more than five hundred brethren, some of whom he himself knew personally; moreover, two appearances, one to James, the other to all the apostles. Finally, to these five he adds that which was granted to himself on the road to Damascus.—We are already acquainted with the first two, one from Luke, the other from Luke and John. The third surprises us, since it is not related in any of the four gospels. But it is probably identical with that of which Matthew speaks, which took place on the mountain of Galilee, whither Jesus had summoned all His followers from before His death (Matt. xxvi. 32, Mark xiv. 28), though in Matthew He addresses only the Eleven in order to call them to their mission to the whole world. The fourth (James), mentioned by Paul alone, is confirmed by the conversion of the four brothers of Jesus (Acts i. 14). The fifth (all the apostles) is evidently that of the ascension, the word *all* alluding not to James, as has been thought, but rather to Thomas, who had been absent at the time of the first appearance to the Eleven. If mention is not made of the first two appearances in John and Luke, those to Mary Magdalene and the two from Emmaus, it is because they have a private character, Mary and the two disciples not belonging to the circle of the official witnesses chosen by Jesus to declare publicly what concerned Him.

Notwithstanding the diversity of these accounts, it is not difficult to reconstruct by their means the whole course of things. There are ten appearances known:

1. That to Mary, in the morning, at the sepulchre (John and Matthew);
2. That to the two from Emmaus, in the afternoon of the first day (Luke and Mark);

3. That to Peter, a little later, but on the same day (Luke and Paul) ;
4. That to the Eleven (without Thomas), in the evening of this first day (John, Luke, Mark) ;
5. That to Thomas, eight days afterwards (John) ;
6. That to the seven disciples, on the shore of the sea of Galilee (John xxi) ;
7. That to the five hundred believers, on the mountain of Galilee (Matthew, Paul) ;
8. That to James (Paul) ;
9. That of the ascension (Luke, Paul).

Finally, to complete the whole : 10. That to Paul, some years afterwards, on the road to Damascus.

Evidently no one had kept an exact protocol of what occurred in the days which followed the resurrection. Each evangelist has drawn from the treasure of the common recollections what was within his reach, and reproduced what best answered the purpose of his writing. They did not dream of the future critics ; simplicity is the daughter of good faith. But what is striking in this apparent disorder is the remarkable moral gradation in the succession of these appearances. In the first ones, Jesus consoles ; He is in the presence of broken hearts (Mary, the two from Emmaus, Peter). In the following ones (the Twelve, Thomas), He labors, above all, to establish faith in the great fact which has just been accomplished. In the last ones, He more particularly directs the eyes of His followers towards the future by preparing them for the great work of their mission. It is thus, indeed, that He must have spoken and acted, if He really acted and spoke as risen from the dead.

## II.—*The Fact.*

What *really occurred*, which gave occasion to the narratives which we have just studied ?

According to the contemporary Jews, whose assertion was reproduced in the second century by Celsus and in the eighteenth by the author of the Wolfenbützel Fragments, the answer is : nothing at all. This whole history of the resurrection of Jesus is only a fable, the fruit of a premeditated deception on the part of the apostles. They had themselves put the body of Jesus out of the way, and then proclaimed His resurrection.—To this explanation we cannot reply better than by saying, with *Strauss* : “ Without the faith of the apostles in the resurrection of Jesus, the Church would never have been born.” After the death of their Master the apostles were too much disheartened to invent such a fiction, and it was from the conviction of His resurrection that they drew the triumphant faith which was the soul of their ministry. The existence of the Church which has religiously renewed the world is explained with yet greater difficulty by a falsehood than by a miracle.

Others, *Strauss* at their head, answer : Something occurred, but something purely internal and subjective. The apostles were, not impostors, but dupes of their own imagination. They sincerely believed that they saw the appearances which they have related. On the day of Jesus’ death, or the next day, they fled to Galilee ; and, on finding themselves again in the places where they had lived with Him, they imagined that they saw and heard Him again ; these hallucinations were continued during some weeks, and here is what gave rise to the narratives of the appearances.—But, 1. From this point of view, the

first scenes of the appearances of Jesus must be placed in Galilee, not in Jerusalem, as is the case in all the narratives, even in that which may be called the most decidedly Galilean—that of Matthew (xxviii. 1-10).—2. According to all the accounts, and even according to the calumny against the disciples invented by the Jews, the body of Jesus, after the descent from the cross, was left in the hands of the Lord's friends. Now, in the presence of the dead body, all the hallucinations must have vanished. We shall thus be brought back to the first explanation, which makes the disciples impostors—an explanation which Strauss himself declares impossible. If it is said : The Jews got possession of the body and carried it off,—they worked in this case against themselves and for the success of the falsehood which they ascribed to the apostles. And why not bring into broad daylight this point tending to prove criminality instead of confining themselves to accusing the disciples of having put Him out of the way?—3. The hallucinations which are supposed are incompatible with the state of mind of the disciples at this time. The believers so little expected the resurrection of Jesus that it was for the purpose of embalming His body that the women repaired to the sepulchre. If they still had a hope, by reason of the promises which the Lord had made to them before His death, it was that of His return from heaven, whither they believed that He had gone. "Remember me when thou shalt come into thy kingdom," said the thief on the cross. And this, indeed, was undoubtedly what the disciples from Emmaus meant when they said, Luke xxiv. 21 : "Already it is the third day since these things came to pass." The restoration to life of His body broken on the cross was not dreamed of by any one. What those hoped for who hoped for anything was a Parousia, not a resurrection properly so called. And this also is what they think that they behold at the first moment, when Jesus appears to them ; they take Him for a *pure spirit* returning from heaven. How in such a condition of mind could they have been themselves the creators of the appearances of the Risen One?—4. And what if these appearances consisted only in a luminous figure, an ethereal form floating in the distance, seen between heaven and earth, and soon vanishing in the sky ? But it is a person who approaches, who asks them to touch him, who converses with them, who blames them for seeing in him only a spirit, who speaks in a definite way and joins acts with his words ("He breathed on them, saying : Receive ye the Holy Spirit"), who gives positive orders (to assemble on a mountain, to baptize the nations, to tarry in Jerusalem), who has friendly conversations with some of them (the two from Emmaus, Thomas, Peter) ; hallucination does not comport with such features. We must always come back to the supposition of fiction and falsehood. As to a legendary formation, it cannot be thought of here, since Paul, even during the lifetime of the witnesses, alludes to all these accounts.—5. That a nervous person has hallucinations is a fact often noticed ; but that a second person shares these illusions is a thing unexampled. Now this phenomenon takes place simultaneously not in two, but in eleven, and soon even in five hundred persons (1 Cor. xv. 6). The hallucinated Camisards of Cevennes are cited, it is true. But the noises which they heard in the air, the rolling of drums, the singing of psalms, do not in any respect resemble the definite communications which the Lord had with those to whom He appeared and the distinct sight of His person and His features. And if all this were only visions beheld simultaneously by so large a number of persons, it would be necessary to imagine the whole company of the believers raised to such a

strange and morbid degree of exaltation that it would become absolutely incompatible with the calm self-possession, the admirable clearness of mind, the practical energy of will, which every one is forced to admire in the founders of the Church.—6. But the most insoluble difficulty for the partisans of this hypothesis is that which *Keim* has better set forth than any one else—I mean the sudden ending of the appearances. At the end of a few weeks, after eight or nine visions so precise that Paul counts them, as it were, on his fingers—on a certain marked day, that of the ascension, all is over. The visions cease as suddenly as they came; the five hundred who were exalted have returned, as if by enchantment, to cold blood. The Lord, ever living to their faith, has disappeared from their imagination. Although far inferior in intensity, the Montanist exaltation endured for a full half century. Here, at the end of six weeks, the cessation is complete, absolutely ended. In the presence of this fact, it becomes evident that an external cause presided over these extraordinary manifestations, and that, when the cause ceased to act, the phenomenon came to its end. We are thus brought to seek for the historical fact which forms the basis of the narratives that we are studying.

I. Some modern writers (*Paulus*, *Schleiermacher*, and others) think that the death of Jesus was only apparent, and that after a long swoon He came to Himself again under the influence of the aromatics and the cool air of the sepulchre. Some Essenic friends also perhaps aided Him with their care. He appeared again, accordingly, among His followers like one risen from the dead; such is the foundation of the accounts of the appearances which we read in our gospels.—*Strauss* has refuted this hypothesis better than any one else. How, after so cruel a punishment as that of the cross, could Jesus, having been restored by purely natural means, move with perfect ease, go on foot to a distance of some leagues from Jerusalem, and also return to that city the same afternoon; how could He be present without any one seeing His entrance; and disappear without any one noticing His departure? How, above all, could a person who was half dead, who was with difficulty dragged out of his tomb, whose feeble vital breath could not, in any case, have been preserved except by means of care and considerate measures, have produced on the apostles the triumphant impression of a conqueror of death, of the prince of life, and by the sight of Himself have transformed their sadness into enthusiasm, their disheartenment into adoration? And then, finally, in the interval between these visits, what became of this moribund person? Where did He conceal Himself? And how did He bring to an end this strange kind of life in which He was obliged to conceal Himself even from His friends? The critics would persuade us that He died in a Phœnician inn, sparing His disciples the knowledge of this sad ending; . . . it must also be added: leaving them to believe in His triumph over death, and boldly to preach His resurrection! This imposture transferred from the disciples to the Master Himself. Does it become thereby more admissible?

II. The opinion which, without denying the miracle, approaches most nearly to the preceding, is that of *Reuss* and *de Pressensé*. There was in the case of Jesus a real return to life, but in exactly the same body which had previously served Him as an organ. In fact, this body still bears the prints of the nails and of the spear-thrust. *De Pressensé* adds, in proof of this explanation, that Jesus, after the walk to Emmaus, did not reach Jerusalem till a certain time after His two travelling companions, since He did not go to the

company of the disciples in the upper chamber until after the arrival of the latter. He will allow us to attach no great importance to this argument. Why could there not have been an interval between the time of His return and that of His appearance in the chamber where the disciples were assembled? Is it not clear that the Lord's body, although identical in some respects with His previous body, underwent by means of the miraculous fact of the resurrection a profound transformation of nature, and that from that time it lived and acted in entirely new conditions? It appears and disappears in a sudden manner, it obeys the will so far as to become visible in an apartment the doors of which had not opened, it is not recognized by those in whose midst Jesus had passed His life. All this does not allow us to believe that the resurrection consisted for Jesus, as it did for the dead whom He had Himself raised to life, only in a return to the life in His former body. They had returned into their former sphere of infirmity and death; Jesus entered within the higher sphere of incorruptibility.

III. *Weiss* puts forth an entirely opposite opinion. According to him, the resurrection was the complete glorification of the Lord's body, which from this time became the *spiritual body* of which St. Paul speaks, 1 Cor. xv. 44-49. But how are we to explain in that case the sensible appearances of Jesus? For there is no relation between such a body and our earthly senses. It only remains to hold, with *Weiss*, an act of condescension by which the Risen One appropriated to Himself, at certain moments, a sensible form, which He afterwards laid aside. But this material form was not an envelopment of some sort; it bore the traces of the wounds which had been inflicted upon it on the cross. Was there only an appearance here, a sort of disguise? This is impossible. Or, if these visible prints were real, how could they belong to the spiritual body? Moreover, if we take into account the words of the Lord to Mary: "I am not yet ascended, but I ascend to my Father and your Father," it is impossible to mistake the difference between the resurrection and the complete glorification of the Lord. We see from this declaration that the resurrection is indeed the entrance into a higher state, but that this state is not yet perfect. There remains a place for a last divine act, the ascension, which will introduce Him into His state of final glory.

IV. There is only a shade of difference between the theory of *Weiss* and *Sabatier* (set forth in the *Christianisme au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle*, April, 1880). According to the latter there was no return to life for the body put to death on the cross; the real fact was the reappearance of the Lord with an entirely new body, the *spiritual body* of which St. Paul speaks. The material elements of the body in which Jesus had lived here on earth are returned to the earth.—At the foundation, what *Sabatier* thus teaches is nothing else than what the disciples expected, a Parousia, Jesus glorified returning from the other life, but not a resurrection. And yet it is a fact that the reality did not correspond to the expectation of the disciples, but that it went completely beyond it. They went to embalm; they tried to find where the body had been laid; and it was this body which was alive!—Then how can we explain otherwise than by a resurrection the tomb found empty? We have seen that the two suppositions of a removal by the disciples or by the Jews are equally impossible. The return of the material elements to the earth must have been effected by the hands of some agent. Could Jesus have been the digger of His own grave?—Besides, how could Jesus, with a purely spiritual body, have said to the dis-

ciples : "Touch me," show them His wounds, ask them for food, and this to the end of convincing them of the material reality of the body which He had? Sabatier answers that these details are found only in Luke and John, who present to us the appearances under a form materialized by legend, while the normal tradition is still found in Matthew and Mark, and besides in Paul (1 Cor. xv.). In Matthew? But he relates that the women laid hold of *the feet* of Jesus; the feet of a spiritual body? In Mark? But we do not have the conclusion of Mark's narrative. In Paul? But he enumerates five appearances, some of which are identical with those of Luke, and he thus confirms the accounts of the latter. Is it probable, moreover, that Luke, St. Paul's companion in preaching, had on this fundamental point of the resurrection of the Lord a different view from the apostle? And what does Paul himself desire to prove in the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians? That we shall receive a new body without any organic relation to our present body? On the contrary, he emphasizes in every way the close bond of union between these two successive organs of our personality. It is *this mortal* which will put on immortality, *this corruptible* which will put on incorruption. Only the corruptible elements of flesh and blood will be excluded from this transformation, which, according to Phil. iii. 21, will make of the body of our humiliation a body of glory like the present body of the Lord. For a resurrection Sabatier substitutes a creation. By breaking every bond between the present body and the future body, he does away with the victory of the Lord over death, and consequently over sin and condemnation, and thus, while thinking only to treat of a secondary point, does violence to the essence of the Christian redemption.

V. The strangest means of escaping from the notion of a corporeal resurrection and yet attributing some objectivity to the appearances of the Lord was imagined by *Weisse*, and then adopted and developed by *Keim*. The appearances of Jesus risen from the dead were *spiritual* manifestations of Jesus glorified to the minds of His disciples. Their reality belonged only to the inner world; they were nevertheless positive historical facts. But the disappearance of the body of Jesus remains still unexplained, as in most of the preceding hypotheses. And what a strange way of acting is that of a being, *pure spirit*, who, appearing to the mind of His followers, should take so much pains to prove to them that He is indeed flesh and bones, and not pure spirit! And how should the apostles, who were so little expecting a bodily resurrection, have come to substitute for purely spiritual revelations gross material facts?

After having exhausted all these so different explanations, we return to the thought which naturally comes forth from the words of the Lord: "*I am not yet ascended, but I ascend.*" The interval between the resurrection and the ascension of the Lord was a period of transition. He had indeed recovered His former body, but, through the change which was made in His personal position, this body was subjected to new conditions of existence. It was not yet the spiritual body, but the spirit disposed of it more freely; it was already the docile organ of the will. Thus are the opposite phenomena explained which characterize the manifestations of the Lord in this period of His existence; in particular, the sudden appearances and disappearances. Objection is made because of this fact: that the Lord ate. There would be reason in this objection if He ate for hunger, but this act was not the result of a need. He wished to show that He *could* eat—that is to say, that His body was real, that

He was not a pure spirit or a phantom. The ascension consummated what the resurrection had begun.

There are three miracles in the development of nature : 1. The appearance of matter ; 2. The appearance of life in matter ; 3. The appearance of the conscious and free will in the domain of life. There are three decisive miracles in the history of the Lord : 1. His coming in the flesh, or His entrance into material existence ; 2. The realization of life, of holy communion with God in this corporeal existence ; 3. The elevation of this life to the liberty of the divine life by the resurrection and ascension.

## THE CONCLUSION.

XX. 30, 31.

In concluding his narrative, the evangelist gives an account of the *manner* in which he has proceeded (ver. 30) and of the end which he proposed to himself (ver. 31) in composing it.

How are we to explain this so sudden ending, after the conversation of Jesus and Thomas? The narrative contained in the appendix, ch. xxi., shows clearly that the author was not at the end of the materials which he possessed. It is not to be doubted, therefore, that this ending is in close and essential connection with the design which has governed the whole narrative, with the *idea* itself of the *book*. If the author wished to trace out the *development of the faith of the disciples and of his own*, the *birth* of this faith must be the starting-point of the narrative—this is indeed the case; comp. i. 19 ff.—and the consummation of this faith must be the end of it. This consummation we find in the exclamation of Thomas.

We need not be astonished, therefore, at not finding in such a gospel the account of the *ascension*, any more than we have found in it that of the *baptism* of Jesus. Both the one and the other of these events are situated outside of the limits which the author had drawn for himself. And we see how destitute of foundation are the consequences which an ill-advised criticism has drawn from this silence, to contest both the faith of the author in these events, and the reality of these facts themselves.<sup>1</sup> If John believes in the reality of the bodily resurrection of Jesus—and the preceding chapter leaves no doubt in this regard—and if he cannot have thought that the body of the Risen One was subjected again to death, there remains but one possibility: it is that he attributed to Him, as the mode of departure, the ascension, as the apostolic Church in general accepted it. This is proved, moreover, by the words which he puts into the mouth of Jesus, vi. 62 and xx. 17. It would be proved, if need were, by his very silence, which excludes every other supposition.

Vv. 30, 31. “*Jesus therefore did many miracles, other than these, in the presence of His<sup>2</sup> disciples, which are not written in this book. 31. But these are written that you may believe<sup>3</sup> that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that, believing, you may have life<sup>4</sup> in his name.*”—The *μέν* prepares the way for the following contrast. The apostle desires to set forth clearly the fact that his thought was not to trace out the complete picture of all that he has seen

<sup>1</sup> *Keim*, III. p. 616: “John knows nothing of a visible ascension, although Jesus speaks of it once in one saying” (vi. 62).

<sup>2</sup> *Αυτου* is omitted by A B E K S Δ 13 Mnn.

<sup>3</sup> *Σ B*: πιστευητε instead of πιστευσητε.

<sup>4</sup> *Σ* omits *και* (and) before *να* (in order that), and, with C D L T<sup>4</sup> 12 Mnn. It<sup>119</sup> adds *αιωνιον* to ζωην (life eternal).

and heard, for the contrary supposition would end in rendering suspicious the facts related in other writings and not mentioned by him, which is far from his thought. He has made, among the multitude of facts included in the history of Jesus, a choice appropriate to the end which he proposed to himself. In the face of this declaration of the author, how can serious critics reason thus : John omits, therefore he denies or is ignorant of, for example, the story of the miraculous birth, the temptation, the healings of lepers or demoniacs, the transfiguration, the institution of the Lord's Supper, Gethsemane, the ascension, etc. !—According to some interpreters, from *Chrysostom* to *Baur*, the words : *the signs which Jesus did*, designate only the appearances related in this chapter, as *signs* or proofs of the resurrection ; from which it would follow that these verses, 30 and 31, are the conclusion, not of the gospel, but only of the narrative of the resurrection. This opinion is incompatible : 1, with the term *ποιεῖν*, *to do* : one does not *do* appearances ; 2, with the two expressions *many* and *others* : the appearances were neither so numerous nor so different ; 3, the expression *in this book* shows that the question is of the entire work, and not only of one of its parts.—The *signs* of which John means to speak are essentially the miracles, but not as separate from the teachings, “ which are almost always the commentary on them ” (*Weiss*).—By the terms : *in the presence of His disciples*, John makes prominent the part appointed for the Twelve in the foundation of the Church. They were the *accredited witnesses* of the works of Jesus, chosen to accompany Him, not only for the development of their personal faith, but also with a view to the establishment of faith in the whole world ; comp. xv. 27 and Acts i. 21, 22. Whatever *Luthardt*, *Weiss* and *Keil* may say, it seems to me difficult not to see in the position of the pronoun *τούτῳ*, after the substantive *βιβλίῳ* : “ this book,” a tacit contrast to other writings containing the things omitted in this. This expression, thus understood, accords with all the proofs which we have met of the knowledge which John already had of the Synoptics. The apostle therefore confirms by these words the contents of these gospels, which were earlier than his own, and tells us that he has labored to complete them.

And what *end* did he propose to himself in writing a history of Jesus under these conditions ? Ver. 31 answers this question. He wished to bring his readers to the same faith by which he was himself filled. He consequently selected from the life of his Master the facts and testimonies which had the most effectually contributed to form and strengthen his own faith. From this selection it is that the Gospel of John originated.—In saying *you*, the apostle addresses himself to certain definite Christians, but persons who, as *Luthardt* says, represent for him the whole Church. They *believe* already, no doubt ; but faith must ever advance, and at every step, as we have seen, the previous faith appears as not yet deserving the name of faith (see ii. 11 and elsewhere).—John characterizes Jesus, the object of faith, in such a way as to indicate the two phases which had constituted the development of his own faith : first, *the Christ* ; then, *the Son of God*. The first of these terms recalls to mind the accomplishment of the prophecies and of the theocratic hope. It was in this character that the faith of the disciples had at first welcomed

Him (i. 42, 46). The solemnity with which this notion of *Messiah* is called to mind in this verse, the summary of faith, absolutely sets aside the idea of a tendency opposed to Judaism in the author of the fourth Gospel. But the recognition of the Messiah in Jesus had been only the first step in the apostolic faith. From this point John and his associates were soon raised to a higher conception of the dignity of Him in whom they had believed. In this Messiah they had recognized *the Son of God*. The first title referred to His office ; this one refers to His *person* itself. It is especially since the fifth chapter of our Gospel that this new light finds its way into the souls of the disciples, under the sway of the declarations of Jesus. It has reached its perfection in the words of Thomas : *My Lord and my God*, which have just closed the Gospel.—If these two terms had the same meaning, the second would here be only a mere tautology. The first refers to the relation of Jesus to Israel and to men, the second to His personal relation to God.—If John proposed to make his readers sharers in his faith, it is because he has learned by his own experience that this faith produces life : *that, believing, you may have life*. To receive Jesus as the Son of God is to open one's heart to the fulness of the divine life with which he is himself filled ; human existence is thus filled with blessedness and strength in communion with God. The words *in His name* depend, not on *believing*, but on the expression *have life*. This name is the perfect revelation which Jesus has given of Himself, by manifesting Himself as Christ and as Son of God.

Either, therefore, the author who speaks thus of the design of his book deceives us, or he did not write in the interest of speculation. He aims, not at knowledge, but at faith, and through faith at life. He is not a philosopher, but a witness ; his work as a historian forms a part of his apostolic ministry. In all times, those who *have not seen* will be able through his testimony to reach the same faith and the same life as himself. We are thus enlightened as to the method and the spirit of his book.

## APPENDIX.

### XXI. 1-25.

After the conclusion xx. 30, 31, this section is a surprise to the reader. It contains two scenes : one of a general interest for the whole circle of the disciples (vv. 1-14) ; the other of a more special interest, having reference to the two principal apostles (vv. 15-23). It ends with a new conclusion, the appendix, vv. 24, 25.—The composition of this section must be later than that of the gospel ; this appears, 1, from the formula of conclusion at the end of the preceding chapter ; and, 2, from the connection which we have proved between the conversation of Jesus with Thomas and the general plan of the book. Some—*Hengstenberg, Lange, Hoeleman, Hilgenfeld*, etc.—have sought to efface the final point, set by the author himself in the passage xx. 30, 31. *Lange* seeks to make us regard ch. xxi. as an epilogue serving as a counterpart to the prologue i. 1-18. “In the same way,” he says (*Life of Jesus*, iv. p. 752), “as the evangelist has represented in ch. i. the ante-historic reign of Christ, . . . in the same way he now draws the picture of His post-historic reign, even to the end of the world.” But this comparison is more ingenious than real. It is the apostles who are on the stage in the following narrative, much more than the Lord Himself ; and it is their future destiny which is here foretold, rather than the reign of the glorified Lord which is described. The counterpart of the prologue, from the point of view indicated by *Lange*, is not ch. xxi. ; it is the Apocalypse. *Weitzel* has made a remark which seems to me to have scarcely any better foundation.<sup>1</sup> “Each of the other three Gospels,” he says, “closes with a section relative to the future activity of the apostles ; comp. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, Mark xvi. 20, Luke xxiv. 53. Chapter xxi. has the same part in our Gospel.” It is evident that Jesus, after having risen from the dead, speaks to the apostles in each Gospel respecting their coming work. But such words differ too widely from ch. xxi. of John for any one to be able to draw a conclusion from this fact.—This appendix was certainly composed after the Gospel ; but it must have been composed soon enough to have made it possible to add it to the principal work before the latter was put in circulation in the Church. Otherwise there would undoubtedly have been formed, as for the Gospel of Mark, two classes of copies, one not having the appendix, the other drawing its material from the manuscript in which it had been originally inserted. It is, therefore, between the time of the composition of the Gospel and that of its

<sup>1</sup> *Das Selbstzeugniss des vierten Evangelisten über seine Person*, in the *Stud. u. Kritik.*, 1849, p. 578 ff.

publication that we must place the redaction and addition of this chapter. *Renan* gives nearly the same judgment: "I close the first redaction," he says, "at the end of ch. xx. Chapter xxi. is a nearly contemporaneous addition, either of the author himself or of his disciples" (p. 534). This date is confirmed by the passage which contains the words relative to the future of John (vv. 21-23). We have seen this (Introduct., Vol. I., pp. 166, 167); it is at the time when the death of John, quite recent or foreseen as imminent, seemed to contradict the well-known promise of Jesus, that the correction contained in this passage must have appeared necessary. This fact fixes the date of our chapter. Only we need not infer from this, with *Weiss*, *Reuss* and others, that this correction was the sole purpose of the redaction and of the addition of the entire chapter. Two reasons oppose this: 1. The preamble, vv. 1-20, which would be too considerable; 2. The 14th verse, which too distinctly separates the two parts of the narrative. On the *author* of this appendix, see at ver. 25.

In the appearance, xx. 19-23, Jesus had conferred on the disciples their mission. In the first scene of ch. xxi.—that which concerns the seven disciples, vv. 1-14—He gives them a forever ineffaceable sign of the magnificent success assured to this mission, so far as they shall work in it under His direction.

I.—*Jesus and the Disciples*: vv. 1-14.

This first scene includes two pictures: that of the *fishing* and that of the *repast*.

The fishing: vv. 1-8.

The theatre of this story is remarkable: it is the shores of the sea of Tiberias, in Galilee. By it the Johannean tradition, from which in any case this story emanates, establishes the connection between the narrative of Matthew, which (with the exception of the appearance to the women at Jerusalem) relates only one Galilean appearance, and that of Luke, which contains only appearances in Judea (comp., however, *the forty days* of which Luke speaks, Acts i. 3). Our story furnishes the positive reconciliation between these two forms of narrative, by proving that there had really been appearances on these two theatres. The disciples therefore returned to Galilee after the feast, and temporarily resumed there their previous manner of life. Then, towards the end of the forty days, no doubt at the bidding of Jesus, they repaired to Jerusalem, where they were to begin the work of public preaching; and it is during this new sojourn in Jerusalem that the command must be placed, which the Lord gave to the apostles on the day of the ascension, not to leave that city until the coming of the Holy Spirit (Luke xxiv. 49, comp. with Acts i. 3, 4). Harmonistic expedients, cries *Meyer*; anti-harmonistic prejudice, we will answer.

According to Matthew xxvi. 31, 32 and xxviii. 7-10, all the believers (*the flock*), even the women,—*you* is addressed also to them,—were to assemble again in Galilee after Jesus' death, and there to see Him again. The appearances in Judea, while gathering the apostles together, were only the beginning of this complete reunion of the flock. Through the obstinacy of Thomas, an entire week elapsed before this preliminary

end could be reached. It was after having recovered this sheep who went astray, that the apostles were able to return to Galilee, where Jesus appeared to them at first on the shore of the sea, then on the mountain designated by Him (comp. Matt. xxviii. 16). Although Matthew, in the account of this appearance, the most important of all by reason of the revelations which it contains respecting Christ and the foundation of His Messianic Kingdom, mentions only the leaders of the flock, the Eleven, as responsible agents of this work, we understand, from 1 Cor. xv. 6, that this was the great meeting of all the Galilean believers, to the number of more than *five hundred* persons, which Jesus had had in view from before His death, and in which he took leave of His Church.

Vv. 1, 2. "*After this, Jesus manifested himself once more to the disciples,<sup>1</sup> on the shore of the sea of Tiberias; and this is the way in which he manifested himself. 2 Simon Peter and Thomas, called Didymus, and Nathanael, of Cana in Galilee, and the sons of Zebedee<sup>2</sup> and two others of his disciples, were together.*"—The transition μετὰ ταῦτα, after these things, is familiar to John (v. 1, vi. 1, vii. 1, etc.). It serves to join the appendix to the Gospel, and especially to the narrative of the last appearance, xx. 29. The expression ἐφάνηρσεν ἑαυτόν is also in conformity with John's style (vii. 4, φανέρωσον σεαυτόν; xi. 33, ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν); this form makes prominent the conscious and free will with which Jesus comes forth from the sphere of invisibility to manifest Himself. Until now, being visible, He had manifested His glory; now he manifests His person.—The term *sea of Tiberias* is in the New Testament a purely Johannean designation (vi. 1). The Synoptics say *sea of Galilee* (Matt. iv. 18) or *lake of Gennesaret* (Luke v. 1). The Old Testament knows neither the one nor the other of these expressions. Josephus employs them both.—The clause: *And this is the way in which*, is not useless; it gives an indication beforehand of the solemnity of the scene which is to follow.—Of the seven persons indicated in ver. 2, the first five only are apostles; the last two belong to the number of *the disciples*, in the broad sense which is so frequently the sense of this word in our Gospel (vi. 60, 66, vii. 3, viii. 31, etc.). If it were otherwise, why should they not be designated by name, as well as those who precede? Hengstenberg affirms that "every one must understand that they were Andrew and Philip" (1).—The *sons of Zebedee* occupy, therefore, the last place among the apostles properly so called. This fact is significant; for in all the apostolic lists they are constantly joined with Peter, and placed with him in the first rank. The only reason which explains this circumstance is that the author of this narrative, in its oral or written form, was himself one of the two sons of Zebedee. It has been objected that John never names either himself or his brother. But no more does he do this here; he only designates himself, because he was obliged to indicate his presence in view of the following scene, ver. 7, and especially ver. 22.—Respecting Thomas Didymus, see on xi. 16.—The explanation: *of Cana in Galilee*, had not been given in chap. i. The author makes up for this omission here.—May not the two *disciples* who are not

<sup>1</sup> D H M U X Γ 40 Min. I<sup>h</sup>eriq Syr. Cop. add <sup>2</sup> N D E read οἱ υἱοί, instead of οἱ. αὐτοῦ το μαθητας.

named be that Aristion and that presbyter John of whom Papias speaks as old disciples of the Lord (μαθηταὶ τοῦ Κυρίου), who lived at Ephesus at the time when John wrote, and who had there almost the rank of apostles?<sup>1</sup>

Vv. 3, 4. "Simon Peter says to them, I go a fishing. They say to him, We also go with thee. They went forth<sup>2</sup> and entered<sup>3</sup> immediately<sup>4</sup> into the boat; and they took nothing that night. 4. But when the morning was already<sup>5</sup> come,<sup>6</sup> Jesus stood on<sup>7</sup> the beach; the disciples, however, knew<sup>8</sup> not that it was Jesus."—Between their first call and the beginning of the active ministry of their Master (see at ii. 12), the disciples had returned to their ordinary profession. They seem to have acted in the same way when once they had returned to Galilee after the resurrection. As ordinarily, the initiative comes from Peter.—The word πιάζειν, to take, which is used in vv. 3 and 10, is found again six times in our Gospel, nowhere in the Synoptics (*Hengstenberg*). On the other hand, the word *πρωία* does not occur again in John. *Bäumlein* rightly observes that the *asyndeta λέγει, λέγουσιν, ἐξῆλθον*, etc., are in John's style.—This long night of toil without result had, no doubt, recalled to the apostles that which had preceded their calling to the office of preachers of the Gospel (Luke v.).

Vv. 5, 6. "Jesus says to them, Children, have you anything<sup>9</sup> to eat? They answered him, No. 6. He said to them, Cast the net on the right side of the boat, and you shall find. They cast it therefore,<sup>10</sup> and they were not able<sup>11</sup> to draw it because of the multitude of the fishes."—The term *παιδιά*, young people, boys, is not foreign to the language of John (1 Ep. ii. 13, 18). If the more tender term *τεκνία*, little children, is not used, as in xiii. 33, it is because Jesus could not have expressed Himself thus without making Himself known. He uses the expression of a master speaking to his workmen. The negative sense of the interrogative form *μή τι* may, as in vi. 67, be rendered thus: *You have nothing then . . . ?* The sequel will explain this question. Jesus does not look merely at a catching of fish, as in Luke v., but at a meal. It is not necessary, therefore, to suppose, with *Chrysostom*, *Tholuck* and others, that Jesus wished to present Himself to them as a trader who was desirous of purchasing fish.—The word *προσφάγιον* is not found again in John; it denotes literally what is added to bread at a meal; in this case, the fish.—The apostles suppose that this stranger understands fishing, and that he has noticed some indication fitted to give occasion for his advice. It has been thought that the opposition between the left side of the boat, where they had cast the net during the night to

<sup>1</sup> One more little specimen of *Reuss*' style: On occasion of this supposition, which we expressly have stated as such, he says: "As to the two disciples, we must apply to the commentators who know everything."

<sup>2</sup> A P It<sup>sup</sup> add *καὶ* (*and*) before, and N G L X οὐν (*therefore*) after, ἐξῆλθον (*they went forth*).

<sup>3</sup> T. R. with Δ A: ἀνεβησαν (*went up*); almost all the Mj. : ἐνεβησαν.

<sup>4</sup> N B C D L X Δ some Mnn. It. Vulg. Syr. Cop. omit *εὐθὺς* (*immediately*).

<sup>5</sup> N some Mun. It<sup>sup</sup>erique Vulg. Syr<sup>sch</sup> omit *ἤδη* (*already*) here.

<sup>6</sup> A B C E L 10 Mnn: γινομένης (*coming*), instead of γενομένης.

<sup>7</sup> N A D L M U X read *ἐπι*, instead of *εις* (*τον αἰγιαλον*).

<sup>8</sup> N L X: ἐγνώσαν (*knew*), instead of ᾔδεισαν.

<sup>9</sup> N omits *τι*.

<sup>10</sup> N D Cop.: οἱ δε εβαλον instead of εβαλον οὐν.

<sup>11</sup> N B C D L Δ II 10 Mnn. It<sup>sup</sup>erique Vulg.: ισχυον instead of ισχυσαν.

no purpose, and the right side, where they were about to make their magnificent draught, typified the contrast between the failure of the work of evangelization in Israel and its infinitely rich fruits in the Gentile world. But, besides the fact that this seems contrary to what is related in Acts ii.-v. and xxi. 20 (*μυριάδες*), it is necessary to hold to the general idea of the immense success which will be gained in the world by the preaching of the Gospel, at every time when the apostles shall suffer themselves to be directed by the Lord, and shall work with Him. This meaning could not escape them, provided they remembered the terms of the original call: "*I will make you fishers of living men.*" They could understand it, however, only after having recognized Jesus.

Vv. 7, 8. "*Then that disciple whom Jesus loved says to Peter, It is the Lord! Simon Peter, when he heard that it was the Lord, put on his garment and girded himself (for he was naked); and he cast himself into the sea. 8 But the other disciples came with the boat<sup>1</sup> (for they were not far from the land but about the distance of two hundred cubits), dragging the net with the fishes.*"—How characteristic of the two apostles are the features which appear in these two simple incidents! John contemplates and divines; Peter acts and springs forward. "It will not fail to be noticed," says *Reuss*, "that Peter has need to be instructed by John;" which means that by this detail the author seeks to elevate John above Peter. But in all that follows (vv. 7, 11, 15-17, 19) everything tends, on the contrary, to give Peter the first rank. What results from this is simply that the story tends to characterize the two principal apostles by their different gifts, as they afterwards showed themselves throughout their whole career: Peter, the man of missionary activity; John, of contemplative knowledge.—The garment called *ἐπενδύτης* is an intermediate one between the *χιτών*, the under garment, the shirt, and the *ἱμάτιον*, the outer garment, the mantle; it is the *blouse* of the workman. After having taken it off, Peter was really *naked*, except for the *subligaculum*, the *apron*, required for decency. But we may also hold, with *Meyer*, that he had kept on an undergarment; the Greek usage of the word *γυμνός*, *naked*, authorizes this sense. The word *δεδύσατο*, literally, *he girded himself*, includes the two ideas of *putting on* the garment and *fastening* it.—While Peter springs into the water and swims to the Lord, John remains with the other disciples in the boat. *Πλοιαρίω*, a local dative (*Meyer*), or, better perhaps, instrumental: by means of the boat (in contrast with Peter, who had thrown himself into the water to *swim*). They simply drew the net. The *for* explains how they could have recourse to this means: *They were not far distant from the shore*. Two hundred cubits make nearly a hundred metres (somewhat more than a hundred yards). *Ἄπὸ* is not used for measuring distance except in our Gospel (xi. 18) and in the Apocalypse (xiv. 20), as *Hengstenberg* remarks. The same author observes that the terms *πλοῖον* and *πλοιαρίον* are used alternately in this section, as in vi. 17 ff.

It has been supposed that this story of a miraculous fishing refers to the same event as the similar story in Luke v. 4 ff.; some (*Strauss*, *Weisse*, etc.)

<sup>1</sup> *κ* reads *ἄλλω* before *πλοιαρίω* (with the other boat!).

seeing in John's story a free reproduction of Luke's ; others, as Weiss, finding rather in Luke's story an anticipatory reminiscence of the event related in John xxi. The transposition of a fact in the evangelic history would undoubtedly not be an impossibility. But how can we believe that Peter throwing himself into the water to go to Jesus standing on the shore is only a variation of Peter prostrate on his knees before Him in the boat and saying to Him : "Depart from me, for I am a sinner!" etc., etc.? I think rather that, when Jesus wished to reinstate Peter and place him again at the head of his brethren in the work of the apostolic office, He did so through recalling to his mind, by this magnificent draught of fishes, the circumstances of his first call, and, through encouraging him, by the renewal of this symbol of the unprecedented successes which would crown his work, to give himself anew entirely to this task.

The meal : vv. 9-14.

Vv. 9-11. "When therefore they were come to land,<sup>1</sup> they see a fire of coals there, and a fish laid thereon and bread. 10. Jesus says to them, Bring of the fish which you have just taken. 11. Simon Peter went up<sup>2</sup> on the boat and drew the net to land,<sup>3</sup> full of great fishes, a hundred and fifty-three ; and although there were so many, the net was not broken."—If this draught of fishes is for the disciples the symbol and pledge of the success of their preaching, the meal is undoubtedly the emblem of the spiritual and temporal assistance on which they may count on the part of their glorified Lord, as long as this work shall continue. *Grotius*, *Olshausen* and others have thought that in contrast with the sea which represents the field of labor, the land and the meal represent heaven, from whence Jesus aids the believers, and where He receives them after death. We are more naturally led to the first sense by the preceding question : "You have, then, nothing to eat?"—The word *ἀνθρακία*, *coal-fire*, is found only here and in the story of the denial of St. Peter, and this in John only (xviii. 18; Mark and Luke have *πῦρ* and *φῶς*).—The singular *ὄψαριον*, *roasted fish*, is taken by *Luthardt*, *Meyer*, *Weiss*, in the collective sense : *fish*, as if there were several. They rest upon ver. 13. But in that place there is the article, which may have the generic sense. If there were several, why should Jesus request them to bring of *their own*? Ver. 10 and vi. 9, where the plural is used, speak rather in favor of the singular sense of *ὄψαριον*. Only the narrative does not lay stress upon this ; for in that case *ἐν* would have been necessary.—Whence came this bread and fish? *Luthardt* thinks of the ministry of angels ; *Bäumlein* and *Weiss* attribute the whole to the action of Peter. This disciple may, indeed, have kindled the fire ; but whence could he have procured the bread and the fish? *Lampe* thinks that Jesus had procured these articles of food from some fishermen of the neighborhood ; at all events, He did not create them ; this procedure would be contrary to all the antecedents (ii. 7, vi. 9 ; comp. Vol. I., pp. 349, 350 ; Vol. II., p. 7). The words : *it is the Lord*, relieve us, undoubtedly, from the necessity of

<sup>1</sup> Ἔ Η : ἀνεβησαν, Δ : επεβησαν, instead of ἀπεβησαν.

<sup>2</sup> Ἔ L : ενεβη instead of ανεβη.

<sup>3</sup> Ἔ A B C L P X Δ Π : εις την γην instead of επι της γης.

disturbing ourselves with this question (Luke xix. 31).—The articles of food offered by Jesus must be made complete by the product of their own fishing. This detail would be absolutely incomprehensible, unless this whole scene had a symbolic sense. Jesus wishes to tell them that He will occupy Himself with their wants, but that their faithful labor must co-operate with His benediction and His aid; comp. Ps. cxxviii. 2: “*The fruit of thy labor thou shalt eat.*”—*He drew*: of course, with the aid of his companions; but Peter was the one who directed.—The number *one hundred and fifty-three* has been made the text of the strangest commentaries. *Cyril of Alexandria* sees herein the emblem of God and the Church (100 representing the Gentiles, 50 the Jews, 3 the Trinity). *Augustine* gives himself to unheard-of subtleties (see *Westcott*, who enumerates a large number of other strange explanations, of *Gregory the Great*, *Rupert of Deutz*, etc.). *Hengstenberg* sees in this number an allusion to the 153,600 Canaanitish proselytes who were received into the theocracy in the time of Solomon (2 Chron. ii. 17). According to an expression which is somewhat common at the present day among our critics, this number came from the idea accepted at that time among naturalists, that the total number of kinds of fishes is 153. *Koestlin* has, indeed, cited a passage from Jerome, which seems to prove the existence of this idea among the learned men of the period by a saying of a Cilician poet, named Oppian, a contemporary of Marcus Aurelius: “Those who have written on the species of animals, . . . and among them the very learned Oppian, the Cilician, say that there are 153 kinds of fish, which were all taken by the apostles, and of which none remained uncaught.”<sup>1</sup> This number would, therefore, be the symbol of the totality of the Gentile nations. *Hilgenfeld*, to complete this interpretation, holds that the fish and the bread which Jesus had previously prepared represent the Jewish people. But *Strauss* observes (*Leben Jesu*, 1864, p. 414) that Oppian does not himself indicate the total 153, but that he gives only a not very clear enumeration, the sum of which may as easily be a larger or smaller number as this number itself. Then the work of Oppian is later than that of John, and we are led by the sentence of Jerome himself to conclude that John’s number has been taken advantage of for the purpose of this scientific fable. As to the idea of *Hilgenfeld* (*Einkl.*, p. 718), how can we suppose that a reasonable writer should have been willing to represent the Jewish people under the figure of a roasted fish and bread?<sup>2</sup>

The mention of this number is no more surprising than that of the number of men who were fed and of baskets which were filled, after the multipli-

<sup>1</sup> *Jerome* on Ezek. xlvii. 9: “*Anunt qui de animantium scripsere naturis et proprietate, qui ἀλευθικά tam latino quam græco didicere sermone, de quibus Oppianus Cilix est poeta doctissimus: cliiii. esse genera piscium, quæ omnia capta sunt ab apostolis et nihil remansit inceptum.*”

<sup>2</sup> We shall only indicate in passing the still more fantastic explanations of some modern writers, who find the key of this number in the

calculation of the letters in the name of Peter; thus Egli, according to the Hebrew form: *Schimcon Jonah* (Simon, son of Jona); Volkmar (*Himmelf. Mose*, p. 62), according to the form *Schimcon* (71) *bar* (22) *Jonah* (31) *Kepha* (29); total 153; and finally Keim himself, in this other form: *Schimcon* (71) *Jochanna* (53) *Kepha* (29), in his *Gesch. Jesu*, iii. p. 564. But the name of Peter does not have the least importance in this part of the narrative.

cation of the loaves, in ch. vi. It is the simple fact recalled to mind to prove two things : 1. The richness of the draught of fishes ; 2. The lively interest with which the apostles counted the fishes that were taken.—The fact that the net was unbroken is mentioned, perhaps, as a symbol of the special protection of the Lord given to the Church, and to all those whom it contains.

Vv. 12–14. “*Jesus says to them, Come, and breakfast. But<sup>1</sup> none of the disciples dared to ask him, Who art thou? knowing that it was the Lord.* 13. *Jesus comes near<sup>2</sup> and takes the bread and gives it to them, and the fish likewise.* 14. *This was<sup>3</sup> now the third time that Jesus manifested himself to his<sup>4</sup> disciples after he had risen from the dead.*”—Jesus takes the part of host. He was standing at a little distance, but now He comes forward. A feeling of respectful fear prevents the disciples from approaching this mysterious person. Jesus invites them to eat ; but even then they do not dare to address Him. It is no longer the familiar relation of former days. Nothing is more natural than the apparent contradiction between *know* (to surmise) and not dare to interrogate. The terms *τολμᾶν* and *ἰξετάζειν* are not used elsewhere in John.

The indication given at ver. 14 divides the narrative into two parts. The beginning of ver. 15, however : *When therefore they had breakfasted*, connects the following conversation with the scene of the meal, ver. 13. The author desired to separate what in this appearance had an ordinary character and was related to the work of evangelization represented by the disciples in general who were present, from that which specially concerned the part and the destiny in the future of the two principal apostles, Peter and John.—The expression *τοῦτο ἤδη τρίτον*, *this was already the third time*, contains one of those niceties which we have noticed in several instances in the course of this Gospel. It recalls the forms already explained in ii. 11 : *ταύτην ἐποίησε τὴν ἀρχὴν*, and iv. 54 : *τοῦτο πάλιν δεύτερον σημεῖον ἐποίησεν*. Like these, it has as its aim to correct tacitly the Synoptic narrative. According to Matthew (and Mark ?) the first appearance of Jesus to the disciples seemed to have taken place in Galilee, not in Judea. By no means, says our author : when He appeared to them in Galilee, *it was already the third time* that He showed Himself to them as having risen from the dead. The two preceding appearances to which he alludes are evidently the last two of ch. xx. : vv. 19 ff., vv. 26 ff. He does not count the one to Mary Magdalene, because, as he expressly says, it is of appearances *to the disciples* that he wishes to speak. *Reuss* objects that the disciples present were only seven in number. What matter ? It was a considerable group of them, and it was led by Peter. In the appearance xx. 19 ff. they were not, any more than here, all together.—As to the appearances to the two from Emmaus and to Peter (Luke, Paul), they belong to another category ; they are appearances to certain individuals, not *to the disciples*. The word

<sup>1</sup> B C omit *δε*.

<sup>2</sup>  $\aleph$  B C D L X omit *οὖν* (*therefore*).

<sup>3</sup>  $\aleph$  G L X omit *δε* after *τοῦτο*.

<sup>4</sup> A B C L some Mnn. omit *αὐτοῦ* after *μαθηταῖς*.

already allows us to suppose other *subsequent* appearances ; they are those of Matt. xxviii., and of 1 Cor. xv. 7, and Acts i.

II.—*Peter and John* : vv. 15-23.

Peter : vv. 15-19a.

The following conversation completes the preceding scene by the express reinstatement of St. Peter not only in the apostolic office, but in the direction of the apostolic company and work. No doubt Jesus had announced to him the pardon of his sin in the special appearance which He had granted to him (Luke xxiv. 34, 1 Cor. xv. 5). In the appearance to the disciples in general, xx. 21-23, He had already treated him as an apostle. But He had not yet restored to him the whole of his old position, of which his denial had deprived him—that of chief of the apostles. This is what He does in the first part of the following conversation (vv. 15-17).

Ver. 15. “ *When therefore they had breakfasted, Jesus says to Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jona,<sup>1</sup> lovest thou me more than these do? He says to him, Yes, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He says to him, Feed my lambs.*”<sup>2</sup> As there is a relation, which is perhaps not accidental, between the outward situation in which Peter had been called the first time to the ministry and that which has just been described, there is also a relation between the situation in which he had lost this office by his denial and the fire of coals near which he recovered it.—The title *Simon, son of Jona*, or, according to the reading of some Alexandrian authorities, *Simon, son of John*, is not unintentionally opposed to that of *Simon Peter*, of which the evangelist makes use in this same verse. It reminds Peter of his natural origin, and consequently of the state of sin from which the call of Jesus had drawn him, but into which he had sunk again by his fall. The allusion to the threefold denial of the apostle in the three following questions is not doubtful, whatever *Hengstenberg* may think. The threefold profession of his love for Jesus is to efface, in some sort, the threefold stain which he has brought upon himself. Jesus Himself is anxious to furnish him the occasion for it. By adding : *more than these do*, He certainly reminds Peter of the presumptuous superiority which he had attributed to himself when he said, Matt. xxvi. 33, Mark xiv. 29 : “ *Even if all the rest shall be offended in thee, I will not be offended.*” No doubt, John has not mentioned this saying ; but his narrative is in constant relation to that of the Synoptics. One cites only as a remembered curiosity the interpretation which makes the word *these* the object of *lovest thou*, and which refers it to the fishing implements or to the fish : “ *Lovest thou me more than thou lovest thine old profession ?*” Peter, with a humility enjoined by the remembrance of his fall, at first in his answer rejects these last words : *more than these* ; then he substitutes for the term *ἀγαπᾶν*, *to love* in the higher and spiritual sense of the word, love with the love of reverence, the term *φιλεῖν*, *to cherish*, love in the sense of personal attachment. He thinks that he can without presumption ascribe

<sup>1</sup> B C D L Itierique read Ἰωαννου (*John*) instead of Ἰωνα. S omits this word.

<sup>2</sup> C D : πρόβατα (*sheep*) instead of ἀρνία (*lambs*).

to himself this latter feeling ; and yet he does not do it without expressing a certain distrust of himself and without seeking the guaranty of the testimony of his heart, to which he does not dare to trust any longer, in the infallible knowledge of the hearts of men, which he now attributes to his Master. The question here is not of omniscience in the absolute sense of the word. Comp. ii. 24, 25. This appeal softens, as *Luthardt* says, the too decided character which a simple *yes* would have had.

Upon this answer, Jesus gives back to him the care of the flock. "He confides those whom He loves to the one who loves Him," says *Luthardt*. The expression : *the lambs*, designates, according to some, a particular class of the members of the Church, the children and beginners ; but the whole flock, at the point where things then were, was composed only of those who were beginning and weak. This saying reminds us of that which Jesus had addressed to Peter before his fall : "When thou shalt be restored, strengthen thy brethren" (Luke xxii. 32). The lambs are thus the whole flock of the faithful, apostles and simple believers. The term *feed*, βόσκειν, *cause to feed*, denotes the care of a flock from the point of view of nourishment. This function, in the spiritual sense, implies an inward sympathy which can only spring from love.

Vv. 16, 17. "Jesus says to him again the second time,<sup>1</sup> Simon, son of Jona,<sup>2</sup> lovest thou me? He says to him, Yes,<sup>3</sup> Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He says to him, Lead my sheep.<sup>4</sup> 17. He says to him the third time, Simon, son of Jona,<sup>5</sup> lovest thou me? Peter was grieved because he had said to him the third time, Lovest thou me? And he said to him,<sup>6</sup> Lord, thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus says to him, Feed my sheep."<sup>7</sup>—Jesus renews His question, "in order," as *Weiss* says, "to press Peter to a more severe examination of himself."—As the : *more than these*, had attained its end, Jesus now pardons the apostle ; but he persists in the use of the more elevated term to designate the love, ἀγάπην. Peter, on his side, does not have the boldness to apply such a term to himself ; but he so much the more emphatically affirms his love in the more modest sense of the word φιλεῖν, and by appealing anew to the scrutinizing glance of the Lord. On this condition, Jesus again confides to him His flock, but with two characteristic differences. For the word βόσκειν, *feed*, which refers especially to the collective or private teaching by the word, He substitutes the term ποιμαίνειν, *to lead*, a term which denotes rather the government of the Church as a whole. According to the *Vatican* and *Ephrem MSS.* He uses here the term προβάτια, properly speaking *little sheep*, beloved sheep, instead of πρόβατα, *sheep*. And this reading may be the true one ; for, while expressing a shade of feebleness, like the word *lambs*, this word yet denotes a more advanced state, and forms the transition to the term *sheep*, πρόβατα, in the third phase of the conversation.

<sup>1</sup> N omits δευτερον (*the second time*).

<sup>2</sup> Here also B C D Hierique, this time with N, read Ιωαννου (*John*) instead of Ιωνα.

<sup>3</sup> N omits ναι (*yes*).

<sup>4</sup> B C read προβατια (*young sheep*) instead of

προβατα, which all the rest read.

<sup>5</sup> N B D Hierique : Ιωαννου instead of Ιωνα.

<sup>6</sup> N A D X : λεγει instead of ειπεν.

<sup>7</sup> A B C : προβατια (*young sheep*), instead of προβατα.

Finally, the third question leaves no longer any doubt for Peter respecting the humiliating fact which the Lord wishes to recall to him, and this recollection affects him the more painfully as Jesus this time substitutes for the term ἀγαπᾶν, as Peter had himself done from the beginning, the term φιλεῖν, whereby He seems to call in question even the attachment of an inferior order which the apostle had modestly claimed for himself. Peter feels the point of the sword penetrating to the quick. This time he suppresses the *yes*, the expression of his personal consciousness, and limits himself to making an appeal even more humbly to the penetrating glance of the Lord: "*Thou knowest all things!*" It is under this glance of omniscience that he places himself, as if to say: "See for Thyself if I do not love Thee!" This appeal to the higher knowledge of Jesus springs from the painful feeling of the great illusions which he had indulged respecting himself (*Weiss*). Three ancient manuscripts read here (as two of them do above) προβάτια; but is it not probable that the copyists, not apprehending the shades of meaning, wrongly repeated this diminutive, and that Jesus said this time πρόβατα, my *sheep*, which denotes again the whole flock, but considered as in the normal condition? Jesus resumes the term *feed*, whereby He gives Peter to understand that the general government of the Church is not to prevent the shepherd from occupying himself with the individual and collective instruction of the members of his flock. Acts xx. 31 shows clearly that it was thus that the apostles understood their holy commission. The passage 1 Peter v. 1-4 seems to be an echo of these words of Jesus addressed to the author of that epistle. *Westcott* rightly sets forth with emphasis the thrice repeated pronoun μου (*my*). The Lord does not give up His right of property in those whom He confides to His servants. "*Oves meas pascē,*" says Augustine, "*sicut meas, non sicut tuas.*"

After having restored to Peter his former governing position, Jesus announces to him, vv. 18, 19a, what will be the *end* of his ministry. The connection between this new idea and the preceding dialogue is easy to be apprehended. Peter learns in what way it will be given to him to testify to his Master the love of which he has just made profession, and thus completely to efface his denial.

Vv. 18, 19a. "*Verily, verily, I say to thee, When thou wert younger, thou girdedst thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldest; but, when thou shalt have become old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee and lead thee whither<sup>2</sup> thou wouldest not.* 19a. *In speaking thus, he signified by what death he should glorify God.*"—The form ἀμὴν, ἀμὴν, *verily, verily*, belongs exclusively to John. It is necessary indeed to notice, in the following verse, the correspondence between the three members of the two propositions. To the: *thou wert younger*, answers the: *when thou shalt have become old*. Peter must, therefore, have been at that time in the intermediate period between youth and old age. This accords with the fact that he was already married some time before this (Luke iv. 38). He is placed between the spontaneous movements of the young man (*thou wert*) and the grave passiv-

<sup>1</sup> N D II: ἄλλοι ζώσουσιν (*others shall gird thee*).

<sup>2</sup> N: ποιήσουσι σοι ὅσα (*shall do to thee all that which*), instead of οἷσαι σπον.

ity of the old man (*thou shalt be*). Only the latter will receive from the circumstances a still more serious character than is ordinarily the case.—To the words: *thou girdedst thyself*, the words: *thou shalt stretch forth thy hands and another shall gird thee*, correspond. It is impossible to apply these words, as so many interpreters (several Fathers, *Tholuck*, *de Wette*, *Bäumlein*, etc.) have done, to the act of extending the arms upon the cross for crucifixion. How should this point precede the following ones, which represent the apostle as led to the place of punishment? It is rather, as *Reuss* says, the gesture of passivity face to face with violence. This girding will be the chain of the malefactor; comp. Acts xxi. 11. In this word the annihilation of self-will, the dominant trait in the natural character of Peter, has been found. But the divesting of self began for him long before the period of old age.—Finally, to the words: *And thou walkedst whither thou wouldst*, the last point is set in opposition: “*And he shall lead thee whither thou wouldst not.*” This term *would* refers here to the repugnance of the natural heart to suffering. According to *Bleek*, the word *another* designates Jesus Himself. But this explanation is connected with the purely moral sense, falsely ascribed to the preceding words: *φέρειν*, to carry, more emphatic than *ἄγειν*, to lead (Mark. xv. 22).—The term: *by what death*, refers to death by martyrdom in general, and not specially, as *Reuss* thinks, to the punishment of crucifixion; it excludes the idea of a natural death. The author speaks of the death of Peter as of a fact known by the readers. This had taken place, according to most authorities, in July, 64; according to others, one or two years later. The expression *to glorify God*, used to designate martyrdom, entered into the later ecclesiastical terminology; we find it here in its original freshness. The phrase *τοῦτο δὲ εἶπεν σημαίνων* is especially Johannean, as well as the *πίσω θανάτῳ* which follows; comp. xii. 33.

John: vv. 19b–21.

This conversation relates to the future of John, as the preceding to the future of Peter.

Vv. 19b–21. “*When he had spoken thus, he says to him, Follow me. 20. And Peter, turning about, sees the disciple whom Jesus loved following<sup>1</sup> (he who leaned on Jesus’ breast at the supper and said,<sup>2</sup> Lord,<sup>3</sup> who is he that betrays thee?). 21. Peter, seeing him,<sup>4</sup> says to Jesus, Lord, and this man, what shall befall him?*”—Very diverse meanings have been given to the command: *Follow me*. *Paulus* understood it in the most literal sense: “Follow me to the place whither I am going to lead thee, that I may converse with thee alone.” And this is indeed also the most natural sense, as *Tholuck*, *Weiss* (up to a certain point) and *Westcott* acknowledge. *Chrysostom* and *Bäumlein* understand: “Follow me in the active work of the apostolic ministry.” *Meyer*: “Follow me in the way of martyrdom, where my example leads thee.” *Luthardt*: “Follow me into that invisible world into which I have already entered, and to which martyrdom will lead thee.” But the following words:

<sup>1</sup> N omits ακολουθούντα ος.

<sup>4</sup> N B C D Ἰησοῦν Vulg. Cop. Orig. add οὐν

<sup>2</sup> N: λέγει in: lead of εἶπεν. N C D add αὐτῷ. after τούτου.

<sup>3</sup> N C omit κυριε.

“*Peter, turning about,*” prove that the question is really of a departure of Peter with Jesus—a departure which has begun to take place—and they consequently speak in favor of the literal sense of the word *follow*. This sense is, moreover, that of this same word (*ἀκολουθεῖν*) in the following verse. After having announced to Peter his martyrdom, Jesus begins to walk away, bidding Peter follow Him. John, seeing this, follows them, without having been expressly invited; he feels himself authorized to do so by his intimate relations with Jesus. *Keil* objects that Jesus disappears miraculously, and does not go away thus on His feet. But if He had a conversation to carry on privately with Peter, why could He not have withdrawn for a moment with him? It does not follow from this, however, that the meaning of the command: *Follow me*, is purely outward. It is clear that, by this first step, Peter enters on that path of obedience to Jesus which will lead him to the tragic end of his apostleship. It is thus that the higher sense naturally connects itself with the lower, as in i. 44. This symbolism forms the basis of the entire Gospel of John.—What could be the object of the private conversation which Jesus desired to have with Peter? It is possible that He proposed to give him the instructions necessary for the convoking of those few hundreds of Galilean believers to whom He wished to manifest Himself personally before entirely withdrawing His visible presence from the earth (1 Cor. xv. 6). Matthew expresses himself thus, xxviii. 16, in speaking of this so considerable assemblage: “on the mountain which Jesus had appointed for them.” There was, then, a definite command, a meeting-place assigned with a designated hour. All this implies a communication; and if Peter received it at this moment, this was his re-installation *de facto* in that function of leader of the flock which had just been restored to him *de jure*. The word *turning about* reminds us of xx. 14, 16; it is a form altogether Johannean.—John followed Jesus and Peter; by what right? This is doubtless what the two descriptive phrases by which he is characterized are intended to explain: *The one whom Jesus loved*, and: *The one who reclined on the breast of Jesus and said to Him*. . . . He who had enjoyed such a degree of intimacy with the Master well knew that nothing could occur between Jesus and Peter which must remain a secret to him. This phrase is not, therefore, an unfounded panegyric of John, which contradicts the Johannean origin of the narrative. The *καί* after *ὅς*, “who also,” brings out the relation between this exceptional intimacy and his character of beloved disciple.

The motive of Peter's question, ver. 21, was, not only according to the Tübingen school, but also according to men like *Olshausen*, *Lücke*, *Meyer*, *Bäumlein*, a feeling of jealousy with respect to John. Is it possible to ascribe to a man to whom Jesus has just confided His sheep a character having so little nobility? “If I am to undergo martyrdom, I hope that he also will not escape it!” Peter and John were, on the contrary, closely united, and truly loved each other (ver. 7). The first, with his manly nature, felt for the second, who was more timid and sensitive, what an elder brother feels for his tender and delicate younger brother. It is sympathy which inspires the question: *And this one, what shall befall him?* It is natural that

the emotion awakened in the soul of Peter by the announcement of his own tragic end should express itself in his heart in this thought: "This one—must he, then, also pass through this experience?"

Vv. 22, 23. "*Jesus says to him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is it to thee? Follow thou me!*"<sup>1</sup> 23. *The report spread abroad, therefore, among the brethren that this disciple should not die; but Jesus did not say<sup>2</sup> to him that he should not die, but, If I will that he tarry till I come.*"<sup>3</sup>—This question of Peter, although springing from an affectionate feeling, had something indiscreet in it; this the Lord makes him feel by the words: *What is it to thee?*—The *coming of the Lord*, in the fourth Gospel (ch. xiv.—xvi.), denotes His coming in the Spirit, from the day of Pentecost. This meaning is not applicable here, since Peter, as well as John, was present at that event. In the passage xiv. 3, the expression "the coming" of Jesus includes, in addition to His return in the Spirit, the *death* of the apostles. This application has been attempted here, in the sense that Jesus would predict for John a gentle and natural death at the end of a long apostolic career, in contrast with the martyrdom of Peter. This, or nearly this, is the view of *Grotius, Olshausen, Weitzel* and *Ewald*. But could the Lord mean to say that He returns only for those of His followers who die by a natural death, and not for those who perish by a violent death? This would be a strange, even an absurd idea, and one which is contradicted by the story of the death of Stephen. As the coming of the Lord denotes in the Synoptics and with John himself (1 Ep. ii. 28, iii. 2) the glorious return of Jesus at the end of the present economy, *Meyer, Reuss, Weiss* and others apply this sense here: "If I will that he tarry till my Parousia." It was thus that the contemporaries of John interpreted this saying, until the time of his death; for it is only thus that we can understand the inference, which they drew from it, that he would not die—that is, that he would belong to that company of believers who, being alive at the moment of the Parousia, will not be raised, but translated (1 Cor. xv. 51). This explanation was so much the more natural at that period, since there was a belief in the nearness of the Parousia. It continued even after the death of John, in the form of the popular legend, according to which John was said to have laid himself down in his grave and to be sleeping there until the return of Christ, or in that of the Greek legend, according to which John was said to have been raised immediately after his death, and was to reappear with the two witnesses of the Apocalypse in order to sustain the Church in its last struggle against Antichrist. But, setting aside these legends, if this view is accepted, it must be resolutely maintained, with *Weiss*, that Jesus shared the error of His contemporaries in relation to the nearness of His return, which would absolutely contradict the Synoptic documents (see my Commentary on the Gospel of Luke, Vol. II., pp. 325, 336), or fall back, with *Meyer*, upon the hypothetical form of Jesus'

<sup>1</sup> ⚭ A B C D I<sup>perique</sup> Vulg. Orig. place μοι before η ακολουθει.

<sup>2</sup> ⚭ B C Orig. : ουκ ειπεν δε, instead of και ουκ ειπεν.

<sup>3</sup> We reject here the words *τι προς σε (what is it to thee?)* which are omitted by ⚭ some Mss. It<sup>abiq</sup>.

words : *If I will*, which is no less inadmissible, for Jesus could not have presented as possible (on the condition of His good pleasure) a thing which was impossible.—He promised, according to others (*Lange, Luthardt*, etc.), the preservation of John's life until the great judgment in the fall of Jerusalem, which may indeed be called the first act of the Coming of Christ ; comp. Matt. x. 23 : "I say to you that you shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come ;" and xxvi. 64 : "*Henceforth* you shall see the Son of man seated at the right hand of power and coming on the clouds of heaven." Peter did not see this great manifestation of the glorified Christ, but John survived it. Yes, objects *Weiss*, but far too long for this explanation. But the length of time that John still lived after this event is of little consequence. For the *until* has nothing exclusive in it. Of all these proposed views, this would seem to us the least improbable. The attempt has also been made to apply this saying to the Apocalyptic vision, which Jesus here promised to John (*Bengel, Hengstenberg*) ; or a proof has been sought in it in favor of the necessity of the apostleship even till the end of time (*Thiersch*) ; *Schelling* (comp. *Bonnet*) saw in it the promise of the Johannean period, which, succeeding that of Peter (the middle ages) and that of Paul (the Reformation), would close the earthly development of the Church.—I have already before this observed that, as the primitive epoch of humanity had its Enoch and the theocratic epoch its Elijah, the Christian epoch might well have also its leader freed from death. And I have asked whether John might not in a mysterious way accompany the progress of the Church on earth, as in the scene of the draught of fishes he accompanied to the shore the boat which was suddenly abandoned by Peter. One raises such a question evidently only when one is not completely satisfied with any of the solutions which more naturally present themselves.<sup>1</sup>

From this point is discovered to us the unity of ch. xxi. The foundation of the whole scene is the miraculous draught of fishes, which typifies the future of the Christian ministry, in general. On this foundation the two special narratives stand forth, having relation to the part and destiny of the two principal apostles—Peter, who will leave the boat of the Church suddenly by the violent death of martyrdom, and John, who will accompany it even to the shore.

After this saying relative to John, Jesus again invites Peter to follow Him in order to receive His orders, and to resume, from that moment, the active service of the ministry and of the direction of the apostolate, which had been temporarily interrupted. The *σὺ, thou*, which Jesus makes prominent here (comp. the difference in ver. 19), contrasts Peter with John : "*Thou—do thou think of what I command thee, and leave to God His own secrets.*" The Alexandrian authorities place the *μοι, me*, before the verb,

<sup>1</sup> The idea expressed by *Holtzmann* (art. *Johannes*, in *Schenkel's Bibelleicon*), that this saying of Jesus is only a personal application to John of the promise in Matt. xvi. 28, Mark ix. 1, Luke ix. 27, is ingenious, but does not

suit either the situation so precisely described in which the Synoptics place this promise, or that no less precisely described one in which our Gospel places the saying which is occupying our attention.

which would give it a special emphasis : "Occupy thyself with *me* and with no other!" This seems to me forced. The author, without indicating in ver. 23 the meaning of the saying of Jesus, which perhaps he does not himself know, contents himself with correcting the misapprehension which was connected with it.—The last words : *what is it to thee?* are not indispensable, and it is possible that the reading of the *Sinaitic* MS., which omits them, is the true one. The present *οὐκ ἀποθνῄσκει*, *he does not die*, is that of the idea. We feel that the author reproduces this *λόγος*, this *saying*, just as it was repeated in the Church at the very moment when he was writing.

To *whom* are we to ascribe the redaction of this supplement? The stamp of the Johannine style and manner is so impressed upon it from one end to the other, that there are only two alternatives : either a man living in habitual association with the apostle drew up this narrative, after having often heard it from his lips, or John himself drew it up. Between these two suppositions, the choice is of little consequence. In favor of the second may be alleged : 1. The last place assigned to the two sons of Zebedee among the apostles named in ver. 1 ; 2. The very delicate way in which the finest shades of the conversation between Jesus and Peter are given. For the former may be urged : 1. The use of some terms which are not found again in the writings of John ; 2. The relation between ver. 23 and ver. 24, which easily leads us to regard him who wrote ver. 23 as one of those who say : *We know*, in ver. 24 ; perhaps, also, as the one who speaks in the first person singular in ver. 25.

*Baur* and a part of his school have seen in the redaction and addition of this appendix a manœuvre designed to exalt John, the apostle of Asia Minor, above Peter, the patron of the Church of Rome. But it is precisely Peter who is made prominent in this story (comp. vv. 1, 11, 15–17, 19, 22). So *Koesllin* and *Volkmar* have made a complete turn, and claimed that, contrary to the intention of the whole Gospel, this chapter is a Roman addition designed to make Peter prominent, whom the author of the fourth Gospel had constantly tried to depreciate. *Reuss* expresses himself more circumspectly : the author desired to re-establish the consideration for Peter, compromised by his denial.—The first two suppositions counterbalance each other. The third would suit rather the end which Jesus proposed to Himself in the scene itself, than the design which presided over its redaction.

*Conclusion of the Appendix: vv. 24, 25.*

Vv. 24, 25. "This is the disciple who testifies of these things and who wrote them;<sup>1</sup> and we know that his<sup>2</sup> testimony is true. 25. There are also many other things which<sup>3</sup> Jesus did ; and if they were written in detail, I do not think that the world itself could contain<sup>4</sup> the books<sup>5</sup> which would be written."—This post-script attests two things : 1. The composition of the Gospel by the apostle

<sup>1</sup> Instead of *καὶ γράψας*, B D Cop. read *καὶ οὐ γράψας*.

<sup>2</sup> B C D place *αὐτὸν* before *ἡ μαρτυρία*.

<sup>3</sup> Instead of *οσα*, which T. R. reads (with 13 Mjj. A D, etc.), *ἅ B C X* read *α*.

<sup>4</sup> *ἅ B C Cop.* : *χωρησεν* instead of *χωρησαι*.

<sup>5</sup> *ἅ A B C D* some Mnn. *Itæricæ* Vulg. Syr. Cop. Sah. Orig. omit *αμην* after *βιβλια*. This whole verse 25 is wanting in *ἅ* (not in Cod. 63, as was erroneously stated after the time of Mill, Weststein, Griesbach ; see Tischendorf, 8th ed.).

John (ver. 24) ; 2. The infinite richness of the evangelic history, which would not let itself be confined in any written word, whatever might be its extent (ver. 25).

There are three very different opinions respecting the origin of these two verses. Some (*Hengstenberg, Weitzel, Hoelenmann, Hilgenfeld*, etc.) ascribe them both to the author of ch. xxi., who is at the same time the author of the entire book, either the apostle John (the first three) or a pseudo-John (*Hilgenfeld*). So *Lange* and *Schaff*, who ascribe only the words : “ *And we know that his testimony is true,*” to another hand. *Meyer, Tischendorf*, etc., ascribe ver. 24 to the author of the whole, but they see in ver. 25 a later interpolation. The third party (*Thobuck, Luthardt, Keil*) regard vv. 24, 25 as both added by another hand than that of John, the author of the whole of ch. xxi. *De Wette, Lücke, Weiss* ascribe them also to the author of the appendix, but without admitting that he is the apostle.

The pronoun *ὁὐτος*, *he*, can only refer to the disciple whom Jesus loved (ver. 23), and the pronouns *τούτων* and *ταῦτα*, *these things*, only to the contents of the entire book. For the appendix alone (vv. 1–23) would not have importance enough to occasion such a declaration. It may even be asked whether ch. xxi. is itself included in the expression : *these things*—in this case we should also have in ver. 24 the attestation of the Johannean origin of this chapter—or whether it is not rather the author himself of this ch. xxi., who concludes the appendix by bearing witness to the Johannean origin of the Gospel properly so called. This second view seems to me more probable ; for, as we have seen, the connection of vv. 23 and 24 is so close that it is difficult not to ascribe them to the same pen.

As the conclusion xx. 30, 31 ended the Gospel, so this new conclusion, an imitation of the previous one, closes the entire work, completed by the appendix. The author of this postscript says of the beloved disciple, that it is he *who testifies* (*ὁ μαρτυρῶν*) of the facts related and *who wrote them* (*ὁ γράψας*). If we do not hold that there is a pure and simple imposture here, we must acknowledge that “ *this declaration, which is so precise, excludes all possibility of a merely indirect composition by the apostle John.*” Thus *Weiss* expresses himself in answer to *Weizsäcker* and *Huse* ; we add : and to *Reuss*. The latter thinks that the redactors of this supplement (those who say : “ *we know*”) may have acted in good faith in erroneously ascribing the redaction of the Gospel to the apostle John. At a certain distance they may have mistaken the distinction which the author had himself expressly made between his person and that of the apostle—witness in the passage xix. 35 (*Théol. joh.*, p. 105). But *Reuss* surrenders himself here to an amiable illusion. By affirming the Johannean redaction of the Gospel, these men give themselves out as persons who are acquainted with the state of things, who even know the apostle personally (see below) ; an involuntary error is therefore impossible. They say : *who testifies* and *who wrote*. The present *testifies* refers, according to most (*Weiss, Keil*, etc.), to the permanence of the testimony in this writing composed by John. But in this case the epithet *ὁ μαρτυρῶν*, *who testifies*, should have been placed after *ὁ γράψας* : “ *who wrote, and who thus testifies in the Church in a lasting way.*” But the

priority of the words *who testifies* and the contrast between this *present* participle and the *past* participle which follows do not allow any other meaning than : "who testifies at present, still at this hour" (*Meyer, Luthardt, etc.*). This postscript was added, therefore, during the lifetime of the apostle, "*Johanne adhuc in corpore constituto*," as a manuscript of the Vatican says, citing Papias (*Tischendorf : Wann wurden uns. Ev. verf.*, p. 119) ; which agrees with the design of the appendix. Who, more than John, should have been anxious that the meaning of the saying which the Lord had uttered with respect to him should be set right?—The verb *οἶδαμεν, we know*, cannot have as its subject John himself, either alone, as *Chrysostom* would have it, reading *οἶδα μὲν, I know undoubtedly*, or in company with the persons who surround him (*Weitzel*), or even the readers (*Meyer*). It can only be a plurality of individuals outside of which John himself is found. Who then ? The Fragment of Muratori places on the scene the apostle Andrew and other apostles (Philip perhaps) who lived in Asia at that time, and then the bishops of Ephesus.<sup>1</sup> If the question is of apostles, the *we know* signifies : that, knowing of themselves the facts related, they can testify to their accuracy ; "recognoscentibus cunctis," says the same Fragment. But if this *we* designates the Christians who surrounded John at Ephesus, this "we know" means that, having lived personally with John, they know his sincerity and declare him incapable of relating anything false. There is nothing to prevent us from uniting in the *we* these two classes of persons, in whose number may also be found Aristion and the presbyter John, of whom Papias speaks.<sup>2</sup> The persons who speak thus were in any case the depositaries in whose hands the apostle had placed his work and who had received from him the charge to publish it at a suitable time. It was in the discharge of this commission that they added, no doubt, the appendix of ch. xxi., and then they affixed to it the attestation of ver. 24. Perhaps it was rendered necessary in their view by the striking differences which existed between the history of John and the Synoptic narratives which were already spread abroad in the Church.

Does ver. 25 come from the same plurality of witnesses ? Three indications prevent us from thinking so : 1. The grammatical and syntactic form is more complicated than that of ver. 24 ; 2. The singular *οἶμαι, I think*, forms a contrast with the plural *οἶδαμεν, we know*. Finally, 3. The exaggeration, not without emphasis, which characterizes this verse is in contrast with the simple gravity of ver. 24. On the other hand, we have no right to conclude from this that this verse was interpolated at a time posterior to the publication, as *Meyer* and *Tischendorf* think. True, the *Sinaitic* MS. omits it, but this MS. is alone in this case, and we know how it abounds in omissions and inaccuracies. We may suppose, moreover, an intentional omission occasioned by the strange hyberbole which distinguishes this verse. As it is wanting nowhere else, it is probable that, as in

<sup>1</sup> "John, the disciple, being exhorted by his fellow-disciples and his bishops, said . . . ; in this same night it was revealed to Andrew, one of the apostles . . ." The expression *his bishops (episcopis suis)* does not allow us to

think of any other country than Asia Minor. There only John had had a diocese for himself, whose bishops, installed by him, might have been called *his*.

<sup>2</sup> *Introd.*, Vol. I., p. 43.

ver. 24, it was added to the Gospel at the time of its publication. It is probably a personal addition proceeding from that one of the friends of John, who, in company with all his associates, had drawn up the 24th verse. He afterwards added, of his own impulse, ver. 25. Hence the change from the first person plural to the first person singular, a thing which proves his good faith. Hence also may come, perhaps, the difference of style between these two verses. The tone of the latter is not without some resemblance to that of the emphatic descriptions of Papias, in his picture of the millennial reign, or in his story of the death of Judas, and one might be tempted to find in the aged bishop of Hierapolis the subject of the verb : *I think*. Herein may be the truth pertaining to that strange note in the manuscript of the Vatican which we quoted just now, according to which Papias was the secretary of John in the redaction of his Gospel.<sup>1</sup> In any case, the author of this verse means to say that, if this Gospel is all of it the truth (ver. 24), it is not the *whole* truth. And in speaking thus, the object of his enthusiasm is evidently not the apostle and his writing, but the Master and His work. A complete evangelic narrative is, in his view, a task which cannot be realized by reason of the boundlessness of its subject. He expresses this just and profound sentiment by means of a somewhat strange Oriental hyperbole, such as we find constantly in the letters of Ignatius, but taking care to weaken it by the words : *I think*. It is, indeed, that the infinite inevitably goes beyond the finite, and that the category of the *spirit* is always absolutely superior to that of *space*. Let writings be added to writings to describe "the glory of the only begotten Son of God, full of grace and truth," one of two things must follow : either this series of writings will not exhaust the subject, or, if they exhaust it, they will not be contained in the world !

From this study of the twenty-first chapter we conclude : 1. That the story, vv. 1-23, comes, if not from the hand, at least from the oral narration of the author of the Gospel ; 2. That ver. 24 is an attestation emanating from the friends who surrounded him and who, after having called forth the composition of his work, had received it from him in trust to publish it at the fitting time ; 3. That ver. 25 proceeds from the hand of the one among them who had drawn up the postscript, ver. 24, in the name of all ; 4. That the addition of this solemn attestation (vv. 24, 25) was made, also, during the lifetime of the apostle.—After this, it only remains to hold : either that John is the author and the redactor of our Gospel, as those who publish it testify, or that the anonymous author who composed it in the second century (after having presented himself to the world in this narrative with all the characteristics of the apostle) has carried his shamelessness so far as to cause to be given out by an accomplice of his fraud, or rather—for to such a man nothing is impossible—has himself given out, as if in the name of one or several of John's friends, a certificate of his identity with the apostle. If any one is willing to accept such a story, let him accept it. In our view, it contains its own refutation.

<sup>1</sup> Tischendorf : *Wann wurden unsere Evangelien verfasst*, p. 119.

The work, the study of which we are closing, traces out the realization of an ideal which, as we have more than once observed, in order to be described must have been beheld, and in order to have been beheld, must have been lived. It is not an abstract description, like a character of La Bruyère ; it is a concrete picture, detailed, abounding in positive and precise facts, as well as in sayings original and full of appropriateness—a true human life which is like the transparency through which the divine life shines even upon us.—Every sincere heart will always feel itself as incapable of denying this ideal as it is powerless to create it.

## ADDITIONAL NOTES BY THE AMERICAN EDITOR.

### I.

#### CHAPTER VI.

1. IF the feast referred to in v. 1 was the feast of Purim (see Godet's note on that verse, Vol. I., p. 452 f., and note of Am. Ed., I., p. 552 f.), the Passover alluded to in ver. 4 was the second one in the course of the public ministry of Jesus; comp. ii. 13 and xiii. 1. The insertion of this reference to the feast is no doubt partly, if not wholly, for the purpose of marking the time. Although the chronological arrangement of the narrative is evidently not the primary object of the writer of this Gospel, there is a constant reference to the progress of time in the presentation of what Jesus says and does. If there be anything more here than the mere designation of the date, it may be questioned whether the explanation of Godet, or those of Luthardt, Keil, etc., which connect it with the thought and development of the following discourse, can be insisted upon. There seems, on the one hand, to be no sufficient reason for rejecting the view of Weiss, that the statement is added in connection with the gathering of the crowds; yet, on the other hand, the character of the discourse seems to bring it into a certain relation to the Passover. Godet's explanation has, perhaps, too much of refinement and elaboration.—2. The question why Jesus addressed Philip rather than some other member of the apostolic company is an idle one, and one which cannot be answered. The attempt of Luthardt to find, here an indication that "deliberateness was the ruling feature of Philip's nature," can hardly be considered successful. As Weiss remarks, the fact that the author speaks of Philip as the one questioned points to a personal recollection of the scene on his part. But this is all that we can say with confidence. A later writer, composing the history according to his own will and for a doctrinal purpose, would not have inserted such a detail as this, or that which follows respecting Andrew, in the story which he derived from the Synoptics.—3. The details of the story, so far as the multiplying of the loaves, the arrangement and number of the people, and the gathering up of the fragments are concerned, are the same with those in the earlier Gospels. The differences in minor points may be explained either on the supposition of the presence of this writer at the time and the absence of the others (Mark, Luke), or of an intention on their part to relate the matter with less particularity.—4. Ver. 14 shows that John intended to present before his readers something more than the Synoptic writers had in mind. They give the facts of the story and add nothing further, but he records the miracle as a *σημεῖον* and the impression which, as such, it produced upon the minds of the people who saw it. The apostles were evidently present at this time. They saw the miracle, and we cannot doubt that it was also a

*σημειον* to their minds. Indeed, the declaration of Peter on behalf of them all, which we find at the end of this chapter, is no doubt to be connected, in some special sense, with the impression received from this miracle and the one which immediately followed, vv. 16-21. The two miracles were, accordingly, a part of the progressive proof which confirmed and strengthened the faith of the disciples.—5. The character of the miracle of the loaves corresponds with that of changing the water into wine, in the fact that superabundant provision was made for all, and that creative power was exhibited in both—here in multiplying the loaves, and there in making a new material. There was a difference, however, in the two cases : in the first place, the immense number whose wants were supplied gave a certain greatness to the work which increased the impression of it, and, secondly, the relation of it to those who were filled and who came again to Jesus on the following morning, suggested thoughts which belonged in the central region of the Christian truth. That this miracle, like the one in ch. v., is recorded mainly for the purpose of the discourse which was connected with it, cannot be doubted. In this respect, it went beyond the one at Cana. That miracle had apparently brought to the minds of the disciples the knowledge of the power of Jesus, but had given them little, if indeed any, teaching as to His truth. At that time, indeed, they needed especially the evidence which His power, in itself alone, could give. But now they had been with Him for a year, and the miracles were wrought especially for the teaching.—As bearing upon the truth which He taught, however, and as thus related to the miracle of ch. v., the story and discourse of this chapter are in the true order of progress. The discourse of ch. v. set before them the relation of Jesus to the Father, and thus the divinity of His nature ; that of ch. vi. brings to their minds the relation of this divine Son, who had come into the world as the messenger of the Father, to the life of their souls ; the necessity to the eternal life of feeding upon Him. The thought of this sixth chapter is one which could not have been fully comprehended at the moment ; but it was one which, once finding its way into their minds, must become a seed thought for all their future course, and one which would be, in its suggestions, an ever-growing testimony to the fact that Jesus was the Son of God. We see, therefore, that, so far from mere repetition, there is intentional and natural progress here, as there has been up to this point. The writer does not reach the end at the beginning, as has been claimed, but moves forward with a definite and progressive plan of proof, which bore its fruits in a growing life in the hearts of those who received into themselves its legitimate influence.

## II.

Vv. 16-21 contain the account of the second miracle mentioned in this chapter. This miracle is inserted between the first miracle and the discourse which followed on the next day. If the narrative is viewed simply in the light of biography, the reason why the event is placed here is obvious ; it is placed where it belongs in the order of time. But if we look at the plan of the book as related to the purpose stated in xx. 30, 31, it is worthy

of notice that this chapter presents two developments of faith. The multitude, who were impressed by the miracle of the loaves, declared their conviction that Jesus was the Messiah. They accordingly believed; but the course which they pursued the next day, and the effect upon their minds of His presentation of the necessity of living in and upon Him (see vv. 60, 66), prove that their faith was like that of those who are mentioned in ii. 23-25. The apostles, on the other hand, are not only described as having a faith of a higher order than that of these half-way disciples, but are represented as giving utterance to a more confident and established belief than they had expressed at any previous moment (vv. 68, 69). Is it not probable that the second miracle, following upon the first—a miracle which was so peculiarly fitted to produce a deep impression, both in itself and in the circumstances attendant upon it—was an essential element in this new development of the apostles' faith? May we not account for the upward movement of their belief, as contrasted with the downward movement in that of the many who went back, as connected partly with this second wonderful fact? Certainly the fact that it followed so immediately after the miracle of the loaves was calculated to make them ready and able to say, not only: We have believed, but: We have believed and *know* that Thou art the Holy One of God. The insertion of this miracle, therefore, as well as the other, falls most naturally within the line of the writer's great purpose. The reader who will place himself in thought in the circumstances in which the apostles were at the time, and will open his mind, as they did, to the reception of the evidences, cannot fail to see how their faith grew stronger, or to feel that his own faith is growing stronger under the same influence. The signs which were given in the presence of the disciples, says the author, are written in his book that the reader may, by following the record of them, be led forward in the same progress of faith.

In the account of this second miracle which is given by Matthew, xiv. 33, the apostles in the boat are represented as saying, as they witnessed it, "Of a truth Thou art the Son of God." If this is the record of what they actually said at this moment, it may suggest, in connection with John ver. 14, the likeness and also the difference between the belief of the multitude and that of the Twelve. If, on the other hand, as may not improbably be the fact, Matthew, in his more brief narrative of the whole occasion, places at this point what, in the succession of the events, was really said by Peter in the name of the apostles at the time indicated by John in ver. 69, we have a suggestion in Matthew's narrative of that which is represented by John as the result of the miracles and the discourse taken together.

May not the words of Mark (vi. 51, 52), who says that the apostles were exceedingly amazed when Jesus entered the boat and the wind ceased, but that they did not understand concerning the loaves, suggest that the full conviction indicated in Matt. xiv. 33 came only after the discourse, as indicated in John ver. 69?

The difficulty connected with the words *ἵβηλον* and *εἰθέως* is to be recognized. In the story as given by Mark and Matthew, Jesus seems to be represented as entering the boat (in Matthew, with Peter, who had gone to

meet Him on the sea), and the boat seems to have moved gradually towards the shore, only over calm waters. In John's account, on the other hand, the impression which the reader would naturally get from the verb *ἦθελον* is that Jesus did not enter the boat, and *εὐθέως* would imply that the boat reached the shore immediately. The explanation given by Godet is a possible one, but can hardly be considered altogether satisfactory. It is to be observed, however, that in brief stories such as we find in the Gospels, which are told by all the writers for a purpose which is beyond the mere details considered in themselves, differences of this sort are not unnatural—differences which may not be altogether explicable at a distance of centuries from the date of writing, but with reference to which, even now, we may see possibilities capable of removing them. The New Testament narratives, in this regard, may fairly claim to be treated by opposing critics with as calm a consideration of all these possibilities as should be given in the case of other histories. The harmonists and the critics alike have sometimes been disposed to demand too much of the Gospel writers in this regard.

### III.

Vv. 22-24. The main idea of these verses is sufficiently clear, but there is an irregularity in the sentence which it is, perhaps, impossible to explain with entire success. The simplest construction seems to be that which Godet, R. V., etc., give, and which makes ver. 23 a parenthesis. But this construction does not fully clear away the difficulties, for, if the reading *εἶδον* or *εἶδεν* is adopted in ver. 22, that verse states a fact to which nothing is added by a regular construction which may answer to it and complete the statement; or if, on the other hand, *ἰδών* is taken as the text, it would seem that the sentence ought to read, When the multitude (ver. 24), who had seen that there was only one boat there, etc. (ver. 22), saw that Jesus was not there (ver. 24), they got into the boats which had come from Tiberias since the preceding evening, and crossed over (ver. 24). The reason for the peculiar arrangement of the sentence may, not improbably, be this—that the writer desired to picture the state of mind of the multitude just as it changed, from the beginning of the scene to the end. They first noticed the facts which would naturally lead them to conclude that Jesus was still on the eastern side of the lake; then, that boats had come from the other side in the late evening or early morning; then they thought that, as the disciples had not returned and Jesus was nowhere to be seen, it might be that He had followed them to the western side; then, that, by availing themselves of the newly-arrived boats, they might find Him again and thus successfully accomplish what they desired. The broken sentence gives thus a picture, not other than life-like, of the succession of thoughts or suggestions under such circumstances. It is, at the most, a sacrifice of grammatical regularity for the higher end of vivid description. It is, also, that sort of vivid description which points to a living knowledge of the facts on the part of the writer.

## IV.

Vv. 25-40. 1. The abruptness in the turn of thought from the question of the people to the answer of Jesus may indicate an omission of some intermediate words in the report of the conversation. These words, however, must have revealed to the mind of Jesus that their thoughts were moving in the sphere of earthly curiosity and earthly desire, and so, as everywhere in this Gospel (and to some extent the same thing is noticeable in the earlier gospels), He turns them away at once from the earthly to the spiritual things.—2. Ver. 26 does not seem to intimate that they came to Jesus now for the purpose of having food provided for them again, as it had been on the day before, but that, in view of the fact that they had had such provision for temporal wants in one line, they hoped to find in Jesus one who would, as the great prophet, bring them the blessings which might belong to a temporal and earthly kingdom. They saw the miracle of the preceding day and were impressed by it. They said, Of a truth this is the prophet. But they did not see in it a true *σημείον*, in the sense in which Jesus intended it. They did not have the faith which took hold of the inner life. Hence they asked (ver. 30) for a sign, when He called for this faith, as if no sign had been already given.—3. Faith is presented in this passage as an *ἔργον*, and as the one comprehensive *ἔργον*. But this seems to be rather incidental to the form of the sentence than indicative of a doctrine of faith as a work. As they called on Him to tell them what they must do in working for the meat which abides to eternal life, He tells them that the sum of what they have to do is gathered up into believing in Him. But this believing is set forth in the following discourse as involving the closest union with Jesus, the feeding upon him, and thus it is represented as a working and transforming power renewing the whole life of the soul.—4. In the demand which they make for a new sign it is probable that the miracle wrought on the preceding day may have led them to refer to the manna, rather than any other wonderful manifestation in the Old Testament history. Not a mere provision for a day, like that which He had just given, but something great and continuous, such as had come through Moses, might reasonably, as they thought, be asked for, before they should accept Him as one on whom eternal life for themselves should so wholly depend.—5. The progress of thought from ver. 32 to ver. 35 is as follows: Jesus first denies that the bread which answers to the true idea of bread which He now has in mind (*ἀληθινόν*) was given by Moses, and affirms that it is given by God (ver. 32); secondly, He gives the proof of the affirmative statement—it is God who gives the true bread, because the bread of God is that which descends and gives life to the world, and that which thus gives life can alone be the *ἀληθινός ἄρτος* (ver. 33); thirdly, He declares that He is Himself this bread (ver. 35). The construction of ver. 33 is in accordance with the order of the words, *ἄρτος* being the subject and *ὁ καταβ. κ.τ.λ.* the predicate. The fact that God's bread is that which gives life is the proof that not Moses, but God, gives the ideal bread. The emphasis of the last clause of ver. 33 is especially on the words *ζῶν διδοῖς*

τῷ κόσμῳ. The ideal bread must be the life-giving bread. The close connection between ver. 35 and ver. 33 seems to show that the genitive ζώης is to be explained as equivalent to διδόνς ζώην.—6. The reference in the word εἶπον of ver. 36 is supposed by Weiss, Keil, Milligan and Moulton, among the most recent commentators, to be to the words of ver. 26. Westcott says : “The thought is contained in ver. 26, and the reference may be to those words ; but more probably the reference is to other words like them, spoken at some earlier time.” The general character and plan of John’s Gospel makes it probable that in such cases there is an allusion to something which he has himself recorded, and, if this be the fact in this case, the reference to ver. 26 is somewhat more probable than that to v. 37 ff.—7. The emphasis in ver. 37 ff. is on the word πᾶν. It is, therefore, the universality of the blessing with reference to those who believe, rather than the question of Divine election as limiting it only to them, which is here in mind.—8. Vv. 37–40 are closely connected in thought with ver. 35. As Christ is the life-giving bread, the one who comes to Him and believes on Him will never hunger or thirst (ver. 35), because every such person is a gift to Christ according to the will of the Father, and this will is that the gift, when once made, should never be lost. Four points may be noticed here :—(a) The emphasis which is laid on the absolute security of the continuous and ever-enduring blessing. (b) The foundation of this security in the fact that Christ’s mission to earth is to do the Father’s will—there can be no selfish or arbitrary action on His part, therefore, with reference to those who come to Him by the Father’s gift. (c) The gift of the Father is immediately united with the existence of faith in the one who comes to Christ (comp. vv. 39, 40 in their parallelism, and the relation of the latter to the former through the particle γάρ) ; the Father draws (ver. 44), and the susceptible soul comes with faith by reason of the drawing influence. (d) The experience of those who thus come is set forth from the beginning to the end—first, they are none of them rejected when they come ; secondly, they are none of them lost afterwards, but are all kept safely ; thirdly, they have eternal life from the moment of believing, and it is in this life that they are kept ; fourthly, the consummation at the end is the resurrection. The whole is a development of life, in the carrying out of the Divine will by Christ, which naturally and necessarily moves forward to its completeness.—9. The connection of ἐχθρὸν αἰώνιον (ver. 40) with μὴ ἀπολέσω (ver. 39) points to the idea of duration in αἰώνιον (the quantitative idea) ; the contrast of the ἐχθρὸν and ἀναστήσω, on the other hand, points to the present possession of the life, and thus to the qualitative idea. The two elements are united in the Johannean thought.

## V.

Vv. 41–51a. 1. The Jews mentioned in ver. 41 were probably persons who were present during the conversation with the ὄχλος, and in this sense a part of it ; but we may infer from the technical use of this expression that they formed only a part of the company, and were of a similar character

to that of the leading adversaries of Jesus in Jerusalem, who are ordinarily designated by this title in the Fourth Gospel.—2. The opinion of Meyer seems to be correct, that ver. 42 conveys, rather than otherwise, the impression that Joseph, as well as Mary, were still alive at this time. As the design of the sentence, however, is found, not in itself, but in the words which follow in the closing part of the verse, no conclusion can be confidently drawn from it.—3. The general thought of this passage is similar to that of the verses which immediately precede—the non-receptivity of the unsusceptible soul, and the life which the susceptible soul receives through Christ. The following points, however, may be especially noticed : (a) The *giving* of the Father is here explained as a *drawing*—it is a Divine influence working upon the soul. (b) The soul, in connection with this drawing influence, hears the Father's voice and learns from Him. (c) As thus learning, the soul is ready to find in Christ the full revelation of the Father and of the life (the light-life in which there is no darkness), and thus to believe on Him. (d) Believing on Him and finding eternal life in Him, the soul recognizes in Him the bread which gives life and the bread which has life in itself (*ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς—ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν*, vv. 48, 51), and, feeding upon this bread, it will find its life not ending in death, as was the case with those who ate the manna, but continuing forever.—4. The whole development of thought in this discourse, which bears upon the inner life of the soul, seems to show clearly that, in such verses as 44 and 37, the question is not of God's electing purpose, but of the inward susceptibility to Divine influence. And the same is true of other similar passages in this Gospel.

## VI.

Vv. 51b–59. 1. In ver. 51b a new thought is presented—that the bread of which the discourse is speaking is the flesh of Christ. That the reference in these words is to the participation by faith in Christ as dying for the world's salvation, and not to the Lord's Supper, is proved, first, by the fact that union with Christ by faith is the main thought of the whole discourse ; secondly, by the fact that the life of the believer through Christ is placed in correspondence with that of Christ through the Father ; thirdly, by the entire subordination of the idea of the blood to that of the bread—the former comes in, apparently, only in an incidental way, and the thought returns to the bread alone in ver. 58. The blood has, therefore, no such relation to the bread here as the cup has to the bread in the Supper ; fourthly, because no similar representation of the participation in the Supper as related to the life of the soul is given elsewhere ; fifthly, because no allusion to the Supper is made in the Gospels, in any other place, until it was instituted, and its institution seems to have had such reference to the closing hours of Christ's life and to the future of the disciples after His death as to make an allusion to it beforehand improbable, and especially at this time and in the presence of an audience of this character. So far as we can judge, the apostles had no such understanding of its meaning and import, when it was instituted, as must have been the case, it would

seem, if, as they heard this discourse or thought of it afterwards, they supposed it to refer to a physical eating or to any special rite. The purpose of the Lord's Supper is given by Paul in connection with the words of the institution of it, in 1 Cor. xi. 25, "This do in remembrance of me;" it would be strange, indeed, if such a more complete unfolding of the idea should have been presented to a company of murmuring and unbelieving Galilean Jews. Weiss ed. Mey. says: "It cannot even be said that at least the same idea out of which the Lord's Supper sprang is here expressed (Olshausen, Kling, Tholuck, etc.; comp. Kalnis, Keim, Hengstenberg, Ewald, Godet), or that the appropriation of Christ's life, brought about by faith in His death, which is here demanded as absolutely necessary, forms also the sacred fundamental idea of the institution of the Supper and the condition of its blessedness, from which the application of the passage to the Lord's Supper (but also at the same time to baptism and the efficacy of the word) necessarily arises (Meyer, with a reference to Harless, p. 130 ff.), but, at the most, that a like symbolism to that which is here used lies at the basis of the institution of the Supper." This statement is to be regarded as containing (as Weiss remarks) the most that can properly be said.—The difficulty which is suggested by Godet on page 40, that Jesus, instead of explaining His spiritual conception (if the view above given is adopted), only adds "an expression which is more and more paradoxical, material, and, consequently, unintelligible to His interlocutors," seems to the writer of this note to have no real foundation. It was not the design of Jesus, in these spiritual discourses with His adversaries, to make explanations on the low level of their thought, but rather by repeating His ideas in their boldest and loftiest form to challenge their minds to wrestle with them. He wished to force them to see how far removed they were from the life of which He was speaking, by the very difficulty they found in comprehending the terms in which it was described. He would compel disciples and enemies alike to think, and would give them words and truths which might become seeds for future growth, for the very reason that they were, at the beginning, hard to be understood.

## VII.

Vv. 60–65. The very difficulty in the way of understanding, which has just been referred to, caused the division between the temporary and permanent disciples—the true and the false ones—which needed to be made. The temporary and false ones went back because of the hard saying. The principal question connected with these verses is that of ver. 62. With reference to this question the following points may be noticed: (a) If *λόγος* of ver. 60 refers, as the connection would seem to show that it does, to what had been said about eating His flesh, etc., the point now in mind must be the same: If you are offended by this which I have said, how will it be if, etc.—(b) The words "ascending where I was before" are most naturally contrasted with His present condition, and thus refer to the time of and after His ascension.—(c) The 63d verse shows that the purpose of Jesus was to bring the minds of these professed disciples to interpret His

words spiritually, and to see that His teaching and the life of which He spoke were wholly in the spiritual sphere.—(d) Vv. 64,65 present again the absence of faith and of the divine drawing as the foundation of their whole difficulty.—In view of these considerations two conclusions may be drawn : (x) that the thought of ver. 62 is of a greater difficulty in the matter of comprehension, when He should have passed away from earth to heaven, rather than a less one ; and (y) that the cause of this greater difficulty would be the entire removal of the earthly and physical element. Like the discourse which precedes, therefore, these verses are intended to be a demand upon these hearers to rise into a higher sphere of thought, and place themselves face to face with the Divine truth.

## VIII.

Vv. 66-71. 1. The design of the discourse of this sixth chapter, so far as the apostles were concerned, was undoubtedly to strengthen their faith by calling their thoughts to the mystery of the union of the soul with Christ. We have in this chapter the two kinds of evidence, that of the works and that of the words. The dependence of the latter on the former, and the higher character of the latter, are strikingly exhibited here. In this regard the chapter is a central one of this Gospel.—2. The evangelist gives in vv. 68,69 a new declaration of the apostles' faith. Peter and his associates did not fully understand the words of Jesus, but, in connection with the growth of their love and faith in the progress of their life with Him until now, they found in them no "hard saying," as the others did, but only a new utterance of truth which was to be received and studied in the time to come. They believed that He was the Holy One of God, and that He had the words of eternal life, and so, in the presence of these profound thoughts and sayings, they were ready to listen and wait for greater light. It cannot be supposed that, at the time of the first miracle at Cana, their minds could have opened at all to such sayings. There had been a steady and continuous development since then.—3. As related to the evidence for the truth that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God (xx. 31), this chapter carries the reader's thought into the region of His life-giving power—the inward union of His life with that of the believer as essential to the eternal life of the soul—more fully than the chapters which precede. There is no mere repetition of what goes before, but a suggestion of a new thought, and of a thought which belongs here in the natural order of the growth of the apostles' own inner life and of the proof of the truth for other minds. The Holy One of God as the source of eternal life—the words of Peter's confession—contain the thought of the discourse and the belief of the Twelve as it was now moving forward.—4. The explanation of the difficulties connected with the choice of Judas is to be found in the fact that Jesus acted in accordance with the providential plan of the world's life. We carry back the difficulty thus to the region of the Divine counsels, and there it is only to be placed with the mysteries of other human lives. The case of Judas was a remarkable one, because of the conspicuous position

which his betrayal of Jesus gave him. But the wonder of all living, as related to moral discipline, losses and victories, is beyond the limit of our earthly vision.

## IX.

## CHAPTER VII.

Vv. 1-13. 1. The history now moves forward over a period of six months to the Feast of Tabernacles in October. Nothing can be more manifest than the combination in this Gospel of the two elements, as we may call them, of biographical order and the selection of material for another than a biographical end. A full recognition of this fact is necessary in order to a candid and judicial examination of many of the difficulties in this Gospel, which are suggested by those who doubt its apostolic authorship or its truthfulness.—2. The true explanation of the demand of the brethren seems to be this: that they wished Him to go to Jerusalem, as the proper place for the assuming publicly of His Messianic office. If He was unwilling to do this, it must be that He was conscious of the weakness of His claims. By this demand they would test Him, and they thought He was failing to meet it. The attitude of the brethren does not seem to have been like that of the leading Jews, one of bitter hostility. The fact that they came to believe so soon after the resurrection of Jesus (Acts i. 14) seems to show that they were less "slow of heart to believe." In Mark iii. 21 they appear to be desirous of protecting Him from harm, as one carried away by enthusiasm under a delusion, rather than ready to deliver Him to the hands of His enemies. But they were not prepared to believe, even at this time, when His public ministry was within six months of its ending. Perhaps the very fact of His delay in making Himself known in the manifest and prominent way of which they had thought in their picturing of the Messiah's advent, was a main ground of their doubt and hesitation. They were impatient to have this doubt removed, if it could be. They were not ready to believe, until it was removed.—3. The word *καίρως*, vv. 6, 8, may be regarded as kindred in its use to *ἴρα*, and thus as referring here, when used of Jesus, to the time of His great manifestation of Himself as the Messiah. This view, which is substantially that of Godet, gives the simplest explanation of these verses. What they desired was not merely that He should go to Jerusalem, as an ordinary Jew would go, for the celebration of the feast, but that He should go for the purpose of this public manifestation. That this is the correct view is shown (*a*) by the *ἴρα* clause of ver. 3; (*b*) by the expressions *openly*, as opposed to *in secret*, and *manifest thyself to the world* (ver. 4), comp. *not openly* (ver. 10); (*c*) by the fact that the hatred of the world is given as the reason why the time must be delayed (ver. 7); (*d*) by the satisfactory explanation which it gives of the *I go not up* (*οὐκ*) of ver. 8 (which is more probably the correct text), as connected with the *he went up* of ver. 10; (*e*) by the accordance of this passage, if thus explained, with the plan and character of John's Gospel. It thus becomes not a mere biographical item of little importance for any further purpose, but a part of the great progress towards the

end which this writer carefully follows in his work.—4. Vv. 12, 13 present strikingly the position both of the people and the leaders at this time. It is evident from this Gospel that the Jewish rulers and leading enemies of Jesus moved slowly in the development of their plans against Him. As yet, they had not made public the course which they intended finally to take. Even their own partisans among the people were, apparently, uncertain whether they might not suddenly change to a more favorable attitude. The position of the rulers was, throughout the whole course of the history, a difficult one. They could not, with safety, move too slowly, for the impression made by Jesus on the minds of the people was becoming more and more favorable, and might, at any moment, cause a dangerous excitement or uprising. They could not move too rapidly, for they must have some foundation for severe measures, which should be in some degree satisfactory to the public judgment. The result was, that, for a considerable period after their own feelings were settled in hostility, and probably after their plans were formed with somewhat of definiteness, they still kept the announcement of their purpose from the people. The life-like way in which the course of the rulers is described in this Gospel, from the beginning to the end, is one of the strong indications that the author was himself acquainted with the characters of those of whom he wrote. As he looked back over the remembered experience, from the standpoint of his later life, when he had come to understand all the events from the side of the Divine plan, he felt, and accordingly he declares, that the rulers' failure to carry out their purpose was because *Jesus' hour* had not yet come. But it is evident that he knew equally well, and that he would have his readers know, that the reason of their delay was the feeling in their own minds that *their hour* had not yet arrived. They were waiting for that hour, and even at the end they moved forward to the final act, not because the time seemed fully ripe, but because it seemed impossible to delay any longer.—The verses now before us belong to the time of deliberation and waiting. They were seeking for grounds of decisive action. They were ready to seize upon every occasion for violent dispute. They were sometimes carried away by indignation, and almost prepared to lay hands upon Him (comp. e.g. ver. 30). But this was the sudden outbreak of passion; when reason resumed control, they restrained themselves and waited for a more favorable moment.

## X.

Vv. 14–24. 1. There is, apparently, an abrupt turn in the narrative at ver. 14, if we look only at the outward form of the story. But, when the following verses are closely studied, it seems almost certain that there is a connection with ch. v. and the opposition excited by His work of healing on the Sabbath, which is there mentioned. May it not be, therefore, that the question of ver. 15 is, not merely one of wonder at the character of His teaching, but one expressing their sense of the impropriety of His setting Himself up to be a teacher, and in His teachings even to override the Mosaic law, as shown by His willingness to violate the Sabbatic ordinance? If this view is taken, the movement of the thought towards ver. 19 ff. is

more easily explained.—2. In the answer of Jesus, ver. 16 ff., the following points are worthy of notice : (a) The origin of His teaching, though not found in their schools, is such as may well give Him the knowledge which surprises them. He has learned directly from God. (b) The evidence of this is found in the fact that the moral teacher who speaks from himself will manifest a self-seeking spirit. As He, on the other hand, is only seeking the glory of the one who sends Him forth as a teacher, it must be that He is not an impostor or merely self-moved. (c) The question as to whether this one who sends Him is God, and whether the teaching is God's teaching, is one which any man can decide by placing himself in the right attitude towards God. The way to the light in the sphere of religion is through the will—the willingness to do the will of God.—3. The words *ἀληθείας* and *ἀδικία*, united by *καί* in ver. 18, suggest the connection between this passage concerning the teaching and the following verses, which carry back the thought to ch. v. We may thus explain what seems to be a sudden change of subject at the beginning of ver. 19.—4. The central point of vv. 19–23 is apparently in ver. 21 : *ἓν ἔργον κ.τ.λ.* This *one work* evidently means the miracle of ch. v., and it is with reference to this that the allusion to the law of Moses is introduced.—5. Ver. 20 (comp. viii. 48, x. 20) brings before us the only kind of reference which John makes in his Gospel to demoniacal possession, if indeed this can be properly called such. The absence of instances of such cases of possession in this Gospel has been made an argument against their reality. But such an argument cannot be insisted upon, because John writes so manifestly on a plan of selection that his omissions or insertions may be owing to reasons which we cannot now fully understand, and also because his allusions to miracles are connected with the growth of faith in the disciples, and, especially, with the inner life of the soul.—6. If we could omit *διὰ τοῦτο*, with Tisch., 8th ed., on the authority of the Sinaitic MS., we should escape a difficulty. But the external evidence appears to be so strong in favor of the insertion of the words that they must be received. If regarded as belonging to the text, they are probably to be connected with *θανάσκετε* of ver. 21. Westcott says the usage of John is decisive against this, but it must be noticed that there is no case in John's writings which is parallel with this one, and that there are weighty reasons on the other side, such as the strong and appropriate emphasis secured by this connection of the words and the difficulties which are involved in uniting them with ver. 22. The explanation of Godet, which is similar to that of Westcott, and of Milligan and Moulton, is perhaps the best which can be offered, if the latter connection is assumed. But—apart from any improbability that Moses would be represented as introducing the provision alluded to for the purpose of teaching them to judge rightly on the matter now in question—if Jesus had intended to make such a representation, the sentence, it would seem, would have been arranged differently. As the verses stand, the argument proceeds simply and naturally from ver. 22 to ver. 23, if these words are unconnected with ver. 22. The argument is : Moses' law, through one of its provisions, involves a violation of the Sabbath ordinance ; if this is so, why be angry with me

for a similar violation? The union of *διὰ τοῦτο* with ver. 22 complicates and obscures the thought. Tregelles, R. V. marg. and A. R. V. connect these words with ver. 21; Westcott and Hort and R. V. text with ver. 22.—7. Ver 24, if *διὰ τοῦτο* belongs with ver. 22 and is explained as Godet proposes, brings out a thought which is already foreshadowed by those words. If, on the other hand, the phrase is attached to ver. 21, ver. 24 is an added exhortation, naturally suggested but not previously indicated. This verse will have no bearing on the question of the connection of *διὰ τοῦτο*, for it can be explained satisfactorily on either view respecting that question.

## XI.

Vv. 25–36. 1. The *Ἱεροσολυμῆται* are evidently a different class from the *ὄχλος*, and are more fully acquainted with the desires of the rulers; but even they are left in some doubt and perplexity. That the supposed designs are not carried out is a matter of surprise to them, so that they even ask doubtfully whether it can be that the rulers, after all, recognize that Jesus is the Christ. This accurate description of the state of mind of all parties is what a later writer, of the introvertive character of this author, would have been little disposed to think of or to give. It comes into the narrative, from time to time, incidentally, and testifies of the eye and ear witness.—2. In ver. 28 Jesus acknowledges what they claim as to their knowledge of His origin, but affirms that He has a different origin which they do not understand. He thus, in reality, meets the difficulty in their minds, and shows that He can be the Christ whose origin is unknown, notwithstanding the fact that they know whence He is. This explanation, notwithstanding what Godet says in opposition to it, seems to be the most simple one and meets the demands of the passage.—3. The words *I am from Him*, of ver. 29, may, not improbably, imply a *community of essence* between Jesus and God, as Godet holds; but whether it can be positively affirmed that it must have this meaning, and cannot be in a parallelism of meaning with *He has sent me*, may be questioned. Meyer holds, with Godet, that the clause *He has sent me* is not dependent on *ἐτι*. Weiss ed. Mey. holds the same view. There seems to be no difficulty in adopting either construction, but, if the latter clause is independent, the argument for Godet's view of the meaning of the former clause becomes stronger.—4. The reference in ver. 34, *You shall seek me and not find me*, etc., must, it would seem, be to a seeking for the Messiah as connected with the securing of the life and blessedness of the Messianic kingdom. This verse can hardly be unconnected in thought with viii. 21, where *dying in their sins* takes the place of the words *not find me*, of this verse. The thought is apparently, therefore, that, after rejecting Him and after His death, they would, in their continual seeking after the Messiah—which He truly was—continually fail, and so they would die in their sins and be separated from Him and His kingdom. The reference to the Divine judgments in the destruction of Jerusalem, which Meyer gives, is not suggested by the passage, and is too limited for the general character of the expression. Weiss is correct, also, in denying the position taken by Meyer,

that the explanation given above is inconsistent with the distinct personal reference, and "empties the words of their tragic nerve and force." The force, says Weiss, properly, "lies in the fact that in their seeking after a Messiah they will, without being themselves conscious of it, be seeking after Him who is the only true Messiah, but is then forever separated from them."

## XII.

Vv. 37-52. 1. The explanation given by Godet of the reference to the living water in ver. 37 and the light in viii. 12 as connected with the two great Divine gifts to the Israelites in their life in the wilderness, which was commemorated in this feast, seems to the writer of this note to be the best one which has been offered. At the end of the feast, and when all minds were naturally turned toward the experiences in the desert, it was natural that Jesus should represent Himself and the new life under these figures, as He had done under the figure of the water of the well, at Sychar, and of the bread, in the sixth chapter.—2. The remark of the evangelist in ver. 39, though not having precisely the same form as those in ii. 21, 22, etc., may not improbably be regarded as, like them, indicating an understanding of the meaning of Jesus' words which was obtained only after His ascension. The last clause of the verse declares simply what was the fact with regard to the coming of the Spirit. It does not affirm any absolute necessity in the case. If the Divine plan, however, was to reveal the truth at first by the incarnation of the Logos in the person of a man, with the necessary limitations of a single human life, we can easily understand how the wider and greater spiritual influence should have been introduced only after the glorification of Jesus.—3. The interruption on the part of the people breaks off this discourse, and hence we are unable to determine as confidently as might otherwise be the case what the precise meaning of ver. 38 is. But there is evidently an advance here beyond the thought of iv. 14. In that passage, it is the internal life of the believer which is referred to, but here the outgoing of this internal life in its blessing influence for others is set forth. This working of the interior life outward was, of course, dependent for its fulness on the greater outpouring of the Spirit which began with the Day of Pentecost. It was to be one means by which that glorification of Jesus on earth was to be accomplished, which is alluded to in xii. 23 and xvii 1, and which was to be connected with and follow upon His glorification in heaven.—4. With reference to vv. 41, 42 two points may be noticed : (a) that the supposition on the part of the people here spoken of, that Jesus came from Galilee, may easily be explained in connection with the fact that His life had been passed there almost from its very beginning, and (b) that John does not state his own view, but theirs. The conclusion that he did not know of the birth of Jesus at Bethlehem is simply an inference drawn from the fact that he does not insert here a correction of this error. But his object in the narrative is clearly to give the accurate statement of the condition and progress of opinion in the minds of the people and their rulers, and not to show how far that opinion was correct or incorrect. The critics everywhere demand that the evangelist should follow a plan in accordance with their own precon-

ceived ideas, but he was writing from a different standpoint and with a different purpose.—5. The conduct of Nicodemus here is certainly far from that moral cowardice which has been so generally charged upon him because he came to Jesus at first by night. It is worthy of remark that the oldest and best authorities mostly omit the word *νυκτός* here. The author makes no reference in this passage, therefore, to his coming by night. But, whether he alludes to this fact or not, he does not give any indication of any disapproval of his course.—6. The last clause of ver. 52 may be best explained by supposing that the persons opposing Nicodemus were not speaking of ordinary prophets, but of a great prophet, like *ὁ προφήτης* of ver. 40, or the Christ. Galilee was not the region, they thought, from which such a prophet could be expected to come. If this was their meaning, the difficulty supposed to arise from the case of Jonah is removed.

## XIII.

Vii. 53—viii. 11. In addition to the remarks of Godet in his full and able discussion of this passage, the writer of these notes would say only a few words. The recent English commentator, J. B. McClellan (*The New Testament, a new translation, etc., etc., Vol. I. The Gospels, London, 1875*), takes very strong ground in favor of the genuineness of the passage, and, as one of the latest presentations of that side of the question, the reader may be referred to his work. The external argument here will depend largely for its force on the weight which is given to the oldest manuscripts. The comparatively small school among critics to which McClellan and Dean Burgon belong depreciate the value of *κ* and *B*, and, in this case, the former dismisses them with the remark: “We are entitled—nay, we are *bound* entirely to throw out *κ B*, as already discredited and worthless witnesses in a matter of this kind, in consequence of their ignorant or criminal omission of Mark xvi. 9–20.” If these and the other oldest MSS. are to be allowed a place worthy of respect in the matter of testimony, there can be but little doubt that the external evidence is decidedly against the genuineness of the passage as a part of John’s Gospel. As for the internal argument, the following remarks, it is believed, are justified: (*a*) The progress of thought from vii. 37 to viii. 12 is so natural, especially if Godet’s explanation of the rivers of living water and the light is correct, that the connection of the two verses in the same discourse is antecedently probable. The passage in question seems to break the unity.—(*b*) It can scarcely be questioned that there is a Synoptical, rather than a Johannean, character in this story, its language and style. No similar phenomenon of so remarkable a character is found in this Gospel.—(*c*) The peculiarities of expression, and particularly the use of *δέ* instead of *ὅτι*, are points not easily reconciled with the Johannean authorship. McClellan says, indeed, with regard to *δέ*, that John uses it nearly as often as *ὅτι* (the former about 204 times and the latter 206 times). He also calls attention to the fact that in chs. i., iii. 1–24, xiv., etc. the particle *ὅτι* is not used at all. The question in such cases is not to be determined by mere numbers, but by careful examination of the several instances which are alleged. The absence of the particle in chs. i., xiv., etc., is connected with the paratactic construction which is so characteristic of

John in passages like these, and hence such passages have no bearing on the question now under consideration. As to the other point, the exclusive use of  $\delta\epsilon$  in this passage, as contrasted with that of  $\sigma\nu\nu$ , or  $\sigma\nu\nu$  and  $\delta\epsilon$  together, in the preceding and following context, is a matter which cannot fail to be noticed by the careful student. Nowhere else in the Gospel is such a use of  $\delta\epsilon$  in a long passage to be found. If  $\delta\epsilon$  is found at all, it is found in connection with  $\sigma\nu\nu$ , as in vii. 37-52.—When the great number of variants is considered, in connection with these peculiarities of expression, the internal evidence must be regarded, like the external, as pointing somewhat strongly towards the view that the verses are an interpolation. It must be added, that the story does not seem to fall, as naturally as do the other narratives of this Gospel in general, into the line of testimony and of the development of belief in the minds of the disciples. This point, however, which is also hinted at by Godet, cannot be insisted upon as by any means decisive. R. V. places this passage in brackets and separates it from the preceding and following verses, with an indication in the margin as to the facts in the case so far as the external evidence is concerned.

## XIV.

## CHAPTER VIII.

Vv. 12-20. 1. If the passage containing the story of the woman taken in adultery is omitted, ver. 12 follows soon after vii. 37, and contains what we may believe to have been the second point of the discourse, which would have been developed in both of its parts more fully, had it not been for the interruptions from the multitude and the Pharisees. The question by which Jesus is interrupted in these verses turns the discourse into a new line, and leads Him to speak of the testimony on which He rests. As to the consistency of what He says in ver. 14 with what is said in ver. 31, see Note XXIX., Vol. I., p. 557. This fourteenth verse declares that, in the present case, although He testifies of Himself, His testimony is true, because He is the only man who has the knowledge on which reliable testimony can be founded. In connection with this statement, we must explain vv. 17, 18. In one sense, it seems evident that Jesus does not comply here with the demand of the Mosaic law to which He appeals. There is but one witness besides Himself. But the case is one which allows no more. The only two who can bear testimony are the two who know—and these two, by the necessity of the case, are the one sending and the one sent, for “no man has seen God at any time,” i. 18. The only-begotten Son, therefore, having come in the flesh, must not only be the revealer of God, but He must also be the human witness for Himself. Indeed, the witness of God on His behalf must, in some measure, come through Him. While there is not, therefore, a fulfilment of the Mosaic requirement, in the letter of it, there is a full satisfaction of its spirit.—2. The expression, *You judge according to the flesh*, ver. 15, seems to be immediately connected with the words of ver. 14. As they are wholly unqualified for judging, through want of knowledge, they judge according to the fleshly standard. They look upon Him as a

mere man like themselves. They judge apart from any connection with God. He, on the other hand, in case He passes judgment, does so in union with the Father, and hence His judgment answers to the true condition of things and the true idea. The peculiar form of the sentence : "I judge no one, and if I judge . . . I and the one who sent me," favors the view that there is a reference to a final and decisive judgment which is not made independently of God. In view of this fact, Jesus does not make it His work here on earth to judge any one, and if, on any occasion and in any subordinate sense, He does so, He still does it in accordance with the Father's mind. It seems evident that the last clause of ver. 15 and ver. 16 are parenthetical in their character, and that the thought moves on from vv. 14, 15a, as above explained, to ver. 17 f.—3. The question of the Pharisees in ver. 19 is a challenge to produce the evidence of the Father, of whom He speaks. We can scarcely suppose that, after all which Jesus had said in Jerusalem, these Jewish leaders could have doubted whom He meant by His Father, or could have intended to imply a doubt. But they demanded the production of the evidence from the Father in some conspicuous way which might answer the demands of the law. They said, in substance, You cannot give us the proof from God. The second witness thus fails you. Where is your Father? This seems to be the force of the interrogative particle *ποῦ*. They did not say *τίς*, for this was not the question which was in their minds.—4. In His answer, Jesus presents before them the incapacity which they have, in their present moral state, to appreciate the testimony of God, which comes with its full force only to the soul which has susceptibility to the truth. To know God, they must know Him who reveals Him. Thus we have a new declaration and testimony to the truth for which the Gospel was written.

## XV.

Vv. 21–29. 1. Meyer holds that the words of ver. 21 f. were spoken on a different day from those of the preceding verses. Godet and others hold that it was the same day. Weiss (comp. Keil) regards the question as one which does not admit of a decisive answer. The position of Weiss is probably the correct one, but there seems to be no serious difficulty in supposing that all which is recorded in this chapter took place on one and the same day, the place only being changed at ver. 21.—2. In the words of Jesus contained in ver. 21 (comp. ver. 24) we find, in addition to what is said in the similar sentence in vii. 34, the words, *You will die in your sin (your sins, ver. 24)*. As remarked in Note XI., 4, above, this clause seems to show that the seeking referred to is a seeking for the Messiah as connected with the securing of the life and blessings of the Messianic kingdom. With respect to these words two points may be noticed : (a) That the words are addressed by Jesus to those to whom He had already presented Himself as the Messiah, and in ver. 24 the result mentioned is connected with not believing that He is what He thus claims to be. (b) That dying in sin is apparently presented as a finality—a limit beyond which the hope of entrance into the kingdom is excluded. This passage must be

regarded as one of the most impressive ones in the New Testament, as indicating the termination of the period of probation at the end of this life. With regard to the question whether it can be properly understood as indicating this only in the case of those who have the knowledge of Christ given them before death, it should be observed, in the first place, that everything which Jesus said was, of course, said to those who heard Him and thus knew of His claims ; secondly, that His general manner of teaching was that of addressing personally those who heard Him, and declaring to them the blessing or evil which awaited them, and not of giving doctrinal statements as appertaining to a theological system. The particular declarations of such a teacher are, in general, to be extended more widely from the individual example to mankind, than in the case of one who teaches in the other way. (c) Death is evidently referred to, in these words, as if it were the great deciding-point in human history as related to the matter of escape from the consequences of sin. (d) Jesus does not intimate anywhere else that the other (Gentile) nations will, unlike the Jews, have an opportunity of entering the Messianic kingdom after death. The indications of any such view on the part of the apostolic writers are also, to say the most that can be said, very few and very uncertain. (e) The knowledge of Jesus as the Messiah and of the Christian system which the Jewish hearers of Jesus, generally speaking, can be said to have had—when the contradiction of all their preconceived notions is considered : His refusal to assume earthly power, His obscure origin, His new idea of righteousness, His view of the Messianic kingdom, almost incomprehensible to their earthly mindedness, educated as they were under the influence of the Pharisaic teachers—was, in reality, so little developed, that it is difficult to say how far allowances may not properly have been made for their ignorance, after a similar manner with those which it is thought must be made for the heathen.—It is an assumption, which requires proof, that, when Christ and the apostles carried the Christian message to the men whom they chanced to meet, they placed them in an entirely new position, so far as the limiting of the probation is concerned. The proof needed is, to say the least, neither abundant nor decisive.—3. The words of ver. 23 seem to give the real ground of their continuance in sin and dying in it at the end. It was because they are from the things below and from this world. This was the reason why, when Jesus was presented before them as the Messiah, and as the way, the truth and the life, they did not believe in Him. The antecedent thing lying back of their unbelief was the state of their hearts and will. The refusal to believe, when He came to them, was only the outcome of this. It would seem, therefore, that the true view of the declaration of Jesus here is to be reached by taking the verses together. The man who is in the state of heart and will in which these Jews were, whoever or wherever he may be, will, if he remains in it, die in his sins, and dying thus will not be able to go to the place where Jesus is—that is to say, will not have the blessedness of the eternal life in heaven.—4. Weiss agrees with Godet in making *ἐκ τῶν κάτω*—*ἄνω* refer to the opposition of nature—i.e., origin, and *ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου κ.τ.λ.* to the contrast of disposition and moral activity ; and this, though

not necessarily, is yet not improbably the correct view.—5. The two explanations of the difficult phrase τὴν ἀρχὴν κ.τ.λ. (ver. 25) which are found in the text of R. V. and in the margin of A. R. V. are the most satisfactory which have been offered : “ *Even that which I have also spoken unto you from the beginning,*” and “ *Altogether that which I also speak unto you.*” The use of τὴν ἀρχὴν in each of these two senses is justified by examples. In the former case, He declares that He is what He has been telling them even from the beginning of His public discoursing—that is, the Messiah, the one sent from God, the one who has seen God and come forth from God to bring the full revelation of Him to the world. In the other case, the meaning may perhaps be the same, except that the idea of *from the beginning* is not contained in the words ; or it may more probably be this : that the answer to the question will be found in the *words* of Jesus : “ *Fathom my speech and you will discern my nature*” (see Godet’s note).—6. The connection of ver. 26 is rather with ver. 25 than ver. 24. The prominent thought of this verse is in the last part of it. The verb λαλῶ, which occurs in vv. 25, 26, 28, seems to show a close connection in thought throughout these verses, and to favor the idea that in the discoursings of Jesus was to be found the truth with regard to Himself. It will be noticed that the λαλῶ of vv. 26, 28 refers to a speaking forth of what was given to Him by the Father to proclaim. This indicates that the λαλῶ of ver. 25 also has a similar reference—at least, that it represents Jesus, in answer to their question, as the one sent from God as a messenger and revealer. The whole context, therefore, is rather favorable than otherwise to the view given in A. R. V. marg.—that the meaning of ver. 25 is, *Altogether that which I also speak unto you.* The bearing of all this upon the meaning of ἐγὼ εἶμι, of ver. 24, is towards the conclusion that the predicate of εἶμι is *he*—i. e., the one sent or the one from above, the Messiah—and that these words are not to be understood as meaning *I am*, in the sense of Deut. xxxii. 39.—7. In regard to ver. 27, the explanation given by Weiss, with whom Keil essentially agrees, or that given by Godet, may be adopted. That the hearers of Jesus must have generally, or oftentimes, connected the words which He spoke with God, cannot be questioned. But, considering the fact that His declarations and teachings were so widely removed from the preconceived ideas of the people, it is not surprising that at times they should have failed to understand His meaning, or that they should even have misunderstood, at one time, statements which were apparently no less clear than those which they partially comprehended at another. The representations of John as to these understandings and misunderstandings are seen to be life-like, so soon as we place ourselves in the real condition and circumstances of the time.—8. Ver. 28 refers to the time which follows the crucifixion and ascension. The declaration of this verse, *you will know*, etc., doubtless has its explanation in connection with the outpouring of the Spirit and the wider proclamation and triumph of the Gospel ; but the probability is that it indicates the beginning of what will be realized in its fullness only as time passes onward. But even now, in the present and intermediate period, before the realization of this future, the Father, He adds, is

still with Him ; and whatever His enemies may do in rejecting Him, He is strong and victorious in the truth which He proclaims.—9. There is an evident unity of thought in this whole passage, and the closing words of ver. 29 present the opposite character of His state of mind and life to theirs, which will finally result in the fact that the place where He is to be will be closed to them.

## XVI.

Vv. 30-50. 1. Whether the words of Jesus contained in these verses were spoken on the same day as those which precede (Meyer) or on the following day (Godet)—Weiss says correctly that this point cannot be determined—there is apparently a close connection between the two passages. Many believed in consequence of what He had just said. Of these some were of the leading Jewish party, the *Ἰουδαῖοι*, but these latter were believers only in a sense corresponding with that indicated in ii. 23 ff. Jesus, therefore, takes up the thought of the preceding verses, and tells them that, in order to their being His disciples in the real sense of the word and their having a real knowledge of the truth, they must abide in His word—i. e., they must believe that He is the one sent from above, and must inwardly live in the sphere of those teachings which, having heard from God, He speaks to the world.—2. The peculiar additional idea, beyond the preceding, which characterizes these verses, is that of freedom. This idea becomes the starting-point of the conversation and discourse which follow. Whether it was designedly introduced as a test of the reality of their faith, or was incidental to the development of His thought respecting the truth which He revealed, cannot be determined. Possibly it was intended to connect His thought with the idea of freedom from the Roman dominion, which so greatly occupied the minds of the Jews at the time ; but all that can be confidently affirmed is, that the Jews here referred to understood it at first in the political sense.—3. The connection of the verses points strongly towards *the Jews who believed Him* as the subject of the verb *answered* in ver. 33. If this is the correct understanding of the writer's meaning, it must be inferred that their belief was of the most superficial character, and this case shows that the author uses the verb *πιστέω* even of the lowest degree of belief in Jesus. The different stages of development indicated by this word, in this Gospel, are very noticeable, and, when carefully observed, they throw light upon the author's plan.—4. The explanation of the words *We have never been in bondage to any one*, which is given by Godet, is favored by Weiss, and is perhaps the best one which can be given.—5. In ver. 37 Jesus addresses these persons as if they were seeking to kill Him. There is a difficulty in supposing that the believing Jews were now desiring to kill Him, but the Jewish party to which they belonged were undoubtedly forming their plans with this end in view. It is possible that He classes them with their party, not because He saw a feeling of this kind in their hearts at the moment, but because this was the feeling of those with whom they had acted, and He saw that they would return to a union with them when their superficial and temporary faith failed.—6. The contrast between

the readiness to receive and abide in the truth and the state of mind in which the Jews are is continued throughout this entire passage. They would not believe that He was the one sent from above to speak the words of God (ver. 24). They would not abide in the word which, as such a Divine messenger, He spoke (ver. 31). They were even seeking to kill Him because He thus spoke the truth (ver. 40). They showed thus that they were slaves of sin and children of the devil, and, as they were resolved to continue as they now were, they would die in their sins (ver. 21). There is, thus, a manifest unity in the discourse, and the allusions to bondage and fatherhood are only for the purpose of more clearly and emphatically bringing out the ideas suggested in ver. 21 ff. This unity favors, but does not absolutely prove, that vv. 30-50 are to be placed on the same day with vv. 21-29. 7. There is evidently a turn of thought in ver. 41 ff., both on the part of the Jews and of Jesus—from their relation to Abraham to their relation to God. The transition is through the words *ἡμεῖς ἐκ πορνείας οὐ γεγεννήμεθα*. These words, it will be observed, are contrasted with *ἕνα πατέρα ἔχομεν τὸν θεόν*, and are also evidently connected with the denial on Jesus' part that Abraham was their father. The true understanding of the passage therefore must, as it would seem, be found in connection with this twofold reference. As He denies their sonship to Abraham, they think that He may refer to sonship in another than the natural sense. But they did not conceive of their sonship in this other sense, except through their descent from Abraham. Hence they say, We are not other than real and legitimate children of Abraham, and therefore we are in the true and most direct sense children of God.—8. The words *ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον* indicate pre-existence, and, like the other expressions which Jesus uses of Himself in this discourse, as coming from and revealing the Father, they carry us back in thought to i. 18. These expressions move forward, as we may say, towards ver. 58, where the pre-existence is most distinctly declared.—9. The tendency of opinion among the most recent commentators is very strongly towards referring the phrase "*He was a murderer from the beginning*" to the introduction of death into the world through sin (Rom. v. 12). The argument for this view is derived from *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*; from the fact that the discourse in general has reference to the truth and the moral sphere and relationships; from the fact that the *ψευστής* of ver. 44 points most naturally to Satan's deception of our first parents; and from the somewhat similar passage, 1 John iii. 18. The reference to the murder of Abel by Cain (de Wette, Lücke, and others) is favored by 1 John iii. 12; by the fact that this reference of the words makes what is said of Satan exactly correspond with what is charged upon the Jews—opposition to the truth and the desire of actual murder; and by the fact that the murder of Abel was the first one in history.—10. The last clause of ver. 44 is most simply explained by making *αὐτοῦ* refer to *ψεῦδος*. Westcott proposes, as a more probable translation, "Whenever a man speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own, for his father also is a liar"—"that is, a man by lying reveals his parentage, and acts conformably with it." This, however, involves an altogether improbable, not to say violent,

change of subject from that of the immediately preceding sentence.—11. In closing this part of His discourse, Jesus appeals again to His own truthfulness and freedom from sin and self-seeking, as proving His claim that He is from God (vv. 45-49).

## XVII.

Vv. 51-59. 1. In ver. 51 Jesus turns the discourse to the more positive side, and brings out one of the great thoughts presented in this Gospel, namely, that the eternal life, which begins in the soul at the moment of believing, has no experience of death forever. Physical death is a mere incidental event in the continuous progress of that life ; death as the contrast to the life of the Messianic Kingdom (that is, in the spiritual sense), and thus the death of the future, is altogether excluded.—2. It is the misunderstanding and opposition of the Jews which leads Jesus away from the direct development of the thought of ver. 51, and brings Him again to set forth and defend His claims, and to carry forward His expressions to greater distinctness. The two special points of consideration in the verses which follow are those in ver. 56 and ver. 58.—3. The statement of ver. 56 is to be explained in view of the contrast between *ἡγαλλ. ἴνα ἴδῃ* and *εἶδεν*. No satisfactory account can be given of this contrast, except on the supposition of a vision given to Abraham during his earthly life, and the realization of the vision as he saw the fact from his heavenly abode. This verse is Jesus' answer to the question of the Jews in ver. 53, "*Art thou greater than our father Abraham?*"—4. Ver. 58 may be said to be, in a certain sense, His answer to their question, "*Whom makest thou thyself?*" That ver. 58 declares His pre-existence is placed beyond doubt, (a) by the contrast between *εἰμί* and *γενέσθαι* ; (b) by the fact that, as distinguished from the other places in this Gospel where the phrase *ἐγὼ εἰμι* is found, no predicate is here suggested by the context, and that thus *εἰμί* must have the meaning *to exist* ; (c) by the reference to time in the words of the Jews in ver. 57 ; (d) by the fact that the whole thought of the context is that of His superiority to Abraham, as connected with having seen him and with freedom from death.—5. If we take into consideration the various points in this chapter :—The uniting of Himself with the Father as the only two witnesses who can bear witness as to the one sent from heaven ; the declaration that, if they knew Him, they would know God, and that their true relation to God was dependent on their true relation to Him ; the claim that His words are the truth of God, and that He derives what He says from what He has seen with His Father ; the making death in sins and exclusion from the Messianic Kingdom, on the one hand, and freedom from all real sight and experience of death, on the other, to rest upon the acceptance or rejection of Him ; the affirmation of pre-existence, of a coming out from God, of a being from Him, of being all that is contained in His discoursing with respect to Himself from first to last ;—if we take all this into consideration, we may clearly perceive how closely related this chapter is to ch. v., and how, here, as there, He "makes Himself equal with God"—only there He calls the thoughts of His hearers to His life-giving power and the final judgment

and resurrection as the proofs of this equality, while here He refers them to His pre-existence and His intimate knowledge of God and union with Him. In the natural order of presentation, as well as of impressiveness in the way of proof for the minds of the disciples, the thoughts of the fifth chapter belong before those of the eighth. Ch. v. sets forth the fact of His life-giving power for the soul ; ch. vi. explains this power as like that of food in the physical life ; ch. vii. 37, viii. 14, present it as the quickening and enlivening spiritual force and the light of the soul ; ch. viii. exhibits it as the Divine truth known by Jesus from His intimate union with the Father and revealed to the world by Him as sent from the Father.—6. The action of the Jews in ver. 59 is similar to that in ver. 18—they were moved by the claims which they understood Him to make, to attempt to kill Him. When the progress and connection of the thought in the chapters are observed, this action on their part may be regarded as indicating that they still thought Him, in the eighth chapter, to be claiming for Himself equality with God. In this connection it is also noticeable that, while Jesus had in ch. v. presented God only as the witness for His claims, in this chapter He places Himself with God, and demands recognition in view of the testimony of the two as fulfilling the requirement of the Mosaic law.—7. The discourses of chs. v., vii., viii. were given to the Jews of Jerusalem, that of ch. vi. to a company of people in Galilee ; but the condition of heart and will was alike in both. Though addressed to different audiences, the thoughts fall into a natural order, and they are presented by the author, according to his principle of selection, in the succession both of time and proof.

## XVIII.

## CHAPTER IX.

Vv. 1-41. 1. The miracle recorded in this chapter occurred probably on the same day with the discourses of the closing part of ch. viii., and not improbably (if vii. 53-viii. 11 be rejected) on the day mentioned in vii. 37.—2. The question of the disciples in ver. 2 is one of much difficulty. The exact correspondence in the form of the question respecting the man himself and of that which refers to the parents would seem to indicate the same possibility, to their view, of *his* sinning, which was manifest in the matter of *their* sinning. This fact bears somewhat strongly against the interpretation which makes this double question simply a means of indicating that they saw no possibility of explaining the blindness. On the other hand, there is not sufficient evidence to make it very probable that the disciples supposed that a man could sin before birth. There are some indications, however, of a belief, more or less extended, in the pre-existence or transmigration of souls, and in the existence of sin in the embryo condition of the child ;—and in their desire to obtain from Jesus His explanation of this calamity the disciples might, in their perplexity as to its connection with sin, have asked not only whether it was due to the sins of the man's parents (a thing which they themselves could allow) or to his own sins (a cause

which, though not admitted by themselves, would be by some other persons).—3. The close sequence of vv. 3, 5 may indicate that, to the thought of Jesus, the works of God in this case were to be in the line of light for this man. The physical illumination which is effected by restoring his sight is thus made emblematic of the illumination of the soul, and the miracle is, in this way, brought into immediate connection with the conversation and discourse which precede it in the eighth chapter. The miracle in this case follows the discourse as illustrating and confirming its truth, if this view is correct, instead of suggesting the thoughts of the discourse, as is generally the case in this Gospel. But, here as elsewhere, it takes its place in the development of the proof, in connection with the teaching:—the works and the words.—4. The relation of the external means, which are sometimes used by Jesus when performing miracles, and sometimes not, to the end in view, can only be conjectured. Their use may, not improbably, have been determined by something in the man himself on whom the miracle was wrought, or in the spectators, which made such an element in the work essential to the spiritual impression which Jesus desired to produce.—5. The life-like character of this story of the blind man is more striking than that of any other, perhaps, in the whole circle of the Gospel narrative—the question of the neighbors, etc., and the different answers which they received (vv. 8, 9); the simplicity of the man's answer when interrogated by them as to his cure (vv. 11, 12); the attitude of the Pharisees with regard to the matter—first, trying to make the man believe that Jesus was not a Divinely-sent helper, because He healed on the Sabbath; then, refusing to believe that he had been blind and that Jesus had healed him; then, summoning his parents, in the hope that they would deny it; then, calling the man again and attempting to overbear him by the charge that Jesus was a sinner, and by referring to Moses; and, finally, when they found themselves unsuccessful, saying, "Thou wert altogether born in sins, and dost thou teach us," and thereupon driving him out; again, the progress in the man's answers—first, The man called Jesus told me to go, and I went and gained the blessing, but I know not where He now is; then, I think He is a prophet; then, Whether He is a sinner or not, I do not know, but one thing I do know: whereas I was blind, I now see; then, I have told you the whole story once, why tell it again; then, It is surely a marvellous thing that you do not know whence such a man is, a man who has done such a wonderful miracle; if He were not from God He could not have done it; and lastly, when Jesus appears again and tells him that He is the Son of man, he says, Lord, I believe. Everything in the words and actions of all the participants in the scene has that inimitable naturalness which, in the case of a writer of the peculiar order of mind and character which belonged to the author of this Gospel, could not have been exhibited in his story had he not been personally acquainted with the scene. Whatever the author may have been, he had not the gifts which belong to the writer of fiction who pictures what is unknown with all the reality of life.—6. Two striking facts are noticeable in this chapter: (a) The miracle has a peculiar character, and is the most remarkable one

recorded in this Gospel, with the exception of the raising of Lazarus. It is the giving of sight to one who was born blind. The miracle at Bethesda, where the man who was healed had been thirty-eight years in his illness, leads to the opening of the discourse of ch. v., which sets forth the equality of Jesus with God; this miracle of healing the man who had never seen closes the further development of that thought in ch. viii. Certainly there is no mere repetition, but progress in the miraculous works which are recorded. They are selected from the "many signs which Jesus did" as connected with the development of the author's plan from its beginning to its end. (b) As in the case of the story of the Samaritan woman, Jesus here declares Himself distinctly to this man as the Son of man. The effect of this declaration, as it came to the knowledge of the disciples at the end of this succession of discourses, chs. v.-viii., and after the miracles, chs. v., ix., as well as the one in ch. vi., must have been greatly to strengthen their belief that "Jesus was the Christ," and that life would come through faith in Him.—Westcott says, with regard to vv. 35-41: "The ejection of the blind man who had been healed from the council of the Pharisees furnished the occasion for the beginning of a new society distinct from the dominant Judaism." And in connection with this fact he thinks it is, that Jesus offers Himself here as *the Son of man*. But it seems very doubtful whether this can be affirmed. There is certainly no indication of the formation of a new society at this time, or as following upon this event.—7. In ver. 35 Tregelles, Alford, Meyer, Keil, read *ὄψις τοῦ θεοῦ*; Westcott and Hort agree with Tischendorf, 8th ed., and Godet in reading *ὄψις τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*; Weiss also seems to prefer this reading. R. V. reads *Son of God* in the text, *Son of man* in the margin. McClellan calls the latter reading "another glaring blunder of only  $\times$  B D and Theb!"—8. The words of ver. 39 seem to have followed immediately after those which passed between the man and Jesus, but to have been addressed to the company of persons who surrounded Jesus, or, at least, to have been spoken in their presence. The *κρίμα*, as Meyer remarks, "is an *end*, but not the *ultimate end* of the appearance of Jesus." The expression *You would not have sin* may, perhaps, be explained as referring to an absolute want of all knowledge of right and duty, like this man's blindness to the things of sight, or it may refer to the matter of unbelief. If the former is the true meaning, the negative part of the sentence will hold good in all cases in proportion as the want of knowledge is complete or partial.

## XIX.

## CHAPTER X.

Vv. 1-21. 1. Meyer says that the new chapter should begin with ix. 35. This is correct, at least so far as the close connection of the early verses of this chapter with ix. 35 ff. is concerned. This connection is manifest from the opening words of the chapter, there being no words of transition or indication of any other day or place. The figure which is employed is one which might easily be suggested by the circumstances, and needs no special

explanation. The blind man's case illustrates that of the sheep which hears the voice of its own shepherd, while the action of the Pharisees is that of the thieves and robbers. This connection shows that, not only in ver. 1, but also in ver. 8, the persons referred to are those who, like the Pharisees, professed to be the religious guides and teachers of the people, but who were not in the prophetic line which ended in the coming of the true Messiah.—2. Godet holds that there are three parables in this passage—that of the shepherd, that of the door, and that of the Good Shepherd. Perhaps it is more correct to say that there is one formal parable (comp. ver. 6), and that, while lingering within the sphere of this, Jesus presents Himself in two aspects which are easily suggested by it. The true explanation of ver. 8 is, again, indicated by this immediate connection of ideas. The thieves and robbers of ver. 8 are such as are not in union with Him and not in that Divine line in which He comes.—3. The parable, vv. 1–5, presents the two ideas of the door and the shepherd, as related to the matter of access to the sheep and their listening to the voice of the one who enters. Jesus afterwards declares that He is the door, and also that He is the shepherd (the Good Shepherd). The true view of the passage seems, therefore, to be this : that the matter is presented in a more general way at first, and then the more specific application is made afterwards. This blind man who had now been healed listens to Jesus and rejects the Pharisees, as the sheep listen to the voice of their own shepherd and flee from a stranger. He and all who have susceptibility to the truth recognize the teacher who brings it and refuse the one who does not. They are of the truth, and therefore they know it when they hear it. In the parable, accordingly, we may believe that the words *door*, etc., are to be regarded as belonging to the figurative representation only, the whole being designed to bring out the thought just mentioned. Only after ver. 6 are we to look for the individual and personal application of the particular words. The question which has been raised by some writers, therefore, as to a personal reference in *θηρωρός* of ver. 3 (whether to Moses, John the Baptist, the Holy Spirit, or some other), is at once set aside, no such reference being intended. This word does not occur in the part of the passage which follows ver. 6. This view of the passage, also, explains the last part of the sixth verse most satisfactorily. The Pharisees who were with Jesus, ix. 35 ff., did not understand as yet, because the parable was as yet presented in a general way. What follows is of the nature of an explanation, such as is added to the parables in some other cases. The word *παροιμία* does not seem to correspond exactly with *παραβολή*, which is used by the Synoptics, and in the present instance the preceding verses, to which it refers, contain an allegory rather than an ordinary parable of the narrative order.—4. The expression “I am the door of the sheep” (ver. 7) may mean the door of entrance to the sheep, or the door for the sheep. The correspondence of *εἰσέλθῃ* with *εἰσερχόμενος* of ver. 2 favors the former view, but the words *shall be saved, shall find pasture, and that they may have life* point very strongly towards the other explanation. In a passage where there is such a manifest freedom in changing the thought from verse to verse (comp. vv. 9, 11), it cannot be regarded as necessary to limit our

interpretation of these expressions by those of ver. 2. If such limitation is not forced upon us, the argument derived from the other elements in the case leads to the conclusion that Jesus is speaking of the door by which the sheep may go in and go out. The opening of this door gives free access to the sources of life, which the sheep may find quietly and peacefully. But the thieves and robbers, who cannot open the door, but climb over the wall of the inclosure, come only to destroy.—5. The thought now turns to a comparison of Christ with the shepherd. The transition is apparently suggested, or is, at least, easily made through the words of the last clause of ver. 10. He is not only the shepherd, but the Good Shepherd, who lays down His life for the sheep. From the necessity of the case, this change from the figure of the door to that of the shepherd is accompanied by a change from the thief to the hireling, as representing the Pharisaic leaders. The sphere of thought now is that of dangers to the flock from enemies—the shepherd protects them at the risk of life, the hireling flees. The repetition of the phrase *lays down his life*, in vv. 15, 17, 18, however, and the presentation of the same idea in other places in this Gospel, seem to indicate something more than this primary idea which belongs to the passage—namely, a reference to the death which He was about to suffer for the redemption of His people. The reaching out of the thought to this greater idea is seen especially in the following verses, 14 ff., where the relation of the shepherd and the sheep is more fully brought out—with reference to the intimate knowledge which each has of the other, and the gift which the former makes for the latter.—6. It is in connection with this wider reach of the thought that the reference to the ingathering of the Gentiles is introduced in ver. 16. The *παροιμία* thus widens at the end into an application to the consummated kingdom of God in the world. Beginning with the comparison of Jesus Himself with the Pharisaic teachers, which was suggested by the case of this man who had been healed and then had believed, it terminates with a vision of the future which was to follow after Jesus' death and resurrection.—7. Vv. 17, 18 now add the thoughts which fundamentally belong to this matter of His sacrifice of Himself for the sheep—that He lays down His life with the purpose of taking it again; that He does this voluntarily, and not by the greater force of another; that this power to lay it down and resume it He has as a prerogative belonging to Himself; that He does the whole work in accordance with the commission and command of His Father. The addition of these thoughts, which are naturally suggested as following upon what had been said in the development and explanation of the *παροιμία*, served to bring the minds of the hearers and the disciples back to what was set forth in ch. viii. of the relation of Jesus to the Father and His Divine origin, and in this way to complete the whole extended discourse from vii. 37 to this point. To the minds of the disciples, as they reflected upon this parable and what followed it—especially as, in their subsequent remembrance of the words, they understood the mystery of Jesus' death and resurrection and of the opening of the Gospel to the Gentiles, and as they came to know more fully in their own experience the union of soul between themselves and the Good Shepherd—the words here recorded must have

become, in a peculiar sense, an added proof that Jesus was the Son of God, the source of life. It cannot be thought strange, by any candid person, that the story of this blind man should have made an ineffaceable impression on the mind of John, and that the details of it and of the remarkable words which followed it should have been inserted by him among the signs which Jesus did in the presence of His disciples.

## XX.

Vv. 22-32. 1. The argument presented by Godet, as against Meyer, Weiss and others, seems satisfactory as showing that Jesus probably left Jerusalem and its neighborhood during the two months which intervened between the Feast of Tabernacles and that of the Dedication. That He did not remain in Jerusalem is certainly rendered probable by the fact that, in vv. 26, 27, He refers to the discourse of vv. 1-18 as if this were the last one which had been given to the hearers. That He remained neither in the city nor its vicinity is probable, because of the danger connected with the increasing excitement against Him. In a narrative prepared, like John's, on the principle of selection, and with separations of months between successive parts, the want of indication of a removal to a more distant region previous to ver. 40 can hardly be pressed as conclusive against an earlier removal.—2. Meyer calls attention to the designation of the particular part of the temple as indicating that the writer was an eye-witness. He also says that the verb ἐκίκλωσαν “graphically sets forth the urgency and obtrusiveness of the Jews,” but, apparently with correctness, he rejects the view which Godet holds, that they pressed in between Jesus and His disciples, and thus enclosed Him in their midst. There seems, at least, to be no sufficient reason for this view.—3. In the words of ver. 24 the Jews evidently call upon Jesus to declare Himself distinctly as to whether He is the Christ. It is proper to bear this demand in mind when considering the answer which He gives in the subsequent verses. This answer begins with the statement that He has already told them what He is. If there is a definite reference to a particular occasion here, it is, no doubt, to the discourses and conversations of chs. viii.—x. 18, in the closing part of which the allusion to the sheep (vv. 26, 27) is found. Such a definite reference is probably to be admitted. After this He appeals to the testimony of His works, and then calls their attention to the same cause of their unbelief which He had given in the former discourse—they had not the susceptibility to the truth, they were not of His sheep. Following upon this, He declares that those who are His sheep have eternal life as His gift, and cannot be wrested from Him so as to lose it. It is in this way that He comes to the more complete statement of His Divine position than has been made at any previous time. The sheep, He says, cannot be taken from Him, because they are given Him by the Father, from whom, as being greater than all, they cannot be taken away; and then He adds, that He and the Father are one. This oneness is either oneness of being or of power—the latter idea is that of the immediate context, and seems to the writer of this note to be the one intended in

this expression. But power is the central element of being, when the natural attributes are considered, and thus unity of power, when connected with the close relations between Jesus and the Father already indicated throughout the preceding part of the Gospel, implies unity of being. The Jews evidently understood this to be the meaning, as they did in v. 18, for they plainly affirm it, and prepare to stone Him for blasphemy (vv. 31, 33); and, on His part, He proceeds, as He did in ch. v., to give a renewed statement of His claims and the evidence for them which they had themselves seen. He is in the Father, and the Father in Him, and this as connected with their oneness of power. He is thus the Son of God and is of the Divine nature. That in these latter statements there was no softening of His previous affirmations, or explaining away of His claims, is proved by the renewed act of hostility on the part of the Jews in ver. 39. To their demand, therefore, "If thou art the Christ, tell us plainly," His final answer is, not merely, "I am the Christ," but "I am one with the Father—He is in me and I am in Him." As the evangelist says in His concluding words, xx. 31, and in his Prologue, Jesus is not only the Christ, but the Son of God, the incarnate Logos.—4. Weiss objects to the explanation of *ἐν ἑσμεν* as referring to unity of power, on the ground that this is the thing intended to be proved. But this does not seem to be the correct view—the thing to be proved is that, if no one can snatch the sheep out of the Father's hand, it follows that no one can seize them out of Jesus' hand, and the proof of this is the oneness of power. Westcott, on the other hand, agrees substantially with what has been said above on this point, and says: "The thought springs from the equality of power (*my hand, my Father's hand*); but infinite power is an essential attribute of God; and it is impossible to suppose that two beings distinct in essence could be equal in power."

## XXI.

Vv. 33–42. 1. There can be no doubt that the Jews understood Jesus as claiming to be God. Ver. 33 clearly proves this. The words of the following verses are to be explained, accordingly, in view of this fact.—2. There are two parts in the answer of Jesus: vv. 34–36, and vv. 37, 38. For the appreciation of the meaning, it must be borne in mind that Jesus enters upon an argument, and does not merely make a new assertion. It is natural, therefore, that what He says should have a progressive character, and should present the claim which He makes through the evidences for it. The claim is that of ver. 30, with what it suggests—which they had interpreted in the sense of ver. 33b. In such a progressive argument we might easily expect Him to begin, as He does, with a sort of *argumentum ad hominem*, founded upon the Old Testament, which they could not reject, and to say, If the O. T. addresses magistrates as gods, in their capacity as God's ministers in the world, surely there is no blasphemy in the appropriation of this title by one who, in a far more exalted sense, is God's ambassador—the one whom He has sent into the world to reveal Himself. His position is therefore, He says, exalted enough, even from the point of view of the Divine messenger

and teacher revealing the truth—in which capacity they might easily recognize Him—to justify the title. But now He moves forward to the more positive side. What His real position is, they may know by the evidence of the works. If they will not be convinced by His words, let these latter teach them. These will show that there is something more in Him than the highest Divine messenger, that He is even the one who is consecrated and sent into the world to make known the truth—that there is a vital and essential union between Him and the Father (*the Father in me and I in the Father*), that union which is implied in, and the necessary condition of, unity of power (I and the Father are one, ver. 30).—3. In ver. 40 Jesus is represented as going again into the region where He is first brought before the reader, in i. 28. The public ministry of Jesus, in a certain sense, closes at this point, and, in accordance with the carefully-arranged plan of the book, it seems not unnatural that the writer should thus bring the narrative again to its starting-point. The introduction of John the Baptist again, at the close, is characteristic of the author. The testimony which John had given before his death produces its fruit when Jesus is drawing near to the time of His own death, and that which had led the writer himself to Jesus, at the beginning, is now represented as bringing many others to a like faith. They believed, as he had done, because of the confirmation which the sight and hearing of Jesus gave to what John had told them. The placing of this testimony and its results at the end of these most striking declarations of Jesus respecting Himself is worthy of notice, as connected with the development of the proof of the truth which the author desires to establish. The insertion of these three verses can hardly be explained, except as they are regarded as having relation to such a plan of the Gospel as has been indicated in these notes—the plan of setting forth progressive testimony and a growing faith which moves along with it; and their presence here, accordingly, gives a new evidence that the author wrote his Gospel under the guiding influence of this plan.—4. The statement here made respecting John corresponds with the declaration of the Prologue with reference to him and with his statements respecting himself in chs. i. and iii. The *σημεία* of this Gospel are, all of them, *σημεία* in the sense of xx. 30, 31. John was not the light, but his mission was to bear testimony to the light. The object of his mission and testimony was “that all might believe through him.” This object was realized in the case of the persons here mentioned. The prominence given to John’s testimony in this Gospel is thus easily explained.

## XXII.

## CHAPTER XI.

Vv. 1-16. 1. The writer turns at the beginning of this chapter to the narrative of those things which were more immediately connected with the death of Jesus; the eleventh and twelfth chapters set forth what was more public and what brought the hostility of the enemies to its highest point, and the following chapters (xiii.-xvii.) what belonged within the circle of

His immediate friendship with His disciples.—2. The raising of Lazarus is the greatest of the miracles recorded in the Gospel history, but it was not the cause of Jesus' death. It was, at the most, one of the special causes of the hastening of the determination on the part of the Jewish leaders to take more decisive measures. The careful reader of the history will see that the rulers were steadily, though slowly, moving towards this end from an early period. They were determined to set aside and destroy His influence and power, but they were afraid to move too rapidly. They hesitated, therefore, and for a considerable period kept their counsels to themselves. But events moved faster than they thought, and the influence of Jesus was constantly increasing. They were in the condition, accordingly, of men who are impelled by circumstances which they cannot control to act more precipitately than prudence or fear would dictate. This miracle thus hastened their action and brought on the final resolution. In view of it, they became convinced that they could not wait as they had done, that the hour was at hand, and that, in the deadly conflict, either He or themselves must perish. But, if the raising of Lazarus had not occurred, the result would not have been changed. It is doubtful whether it would even have been delayed beyond the feast which was then approaching. The progress of things was such, at this time, that the crisis must come.—3. In the consideration of the question as to the omission of this miracle from the narrative of the Synoptics, the exact position and bearing of it on the result is an all-important element. Its relation to the end was not such as to make the account of it necessary to their narrative, or to render its omission, together with all that which immediately preceded the last week in Jerusalem, a matter of special difficulty. To John's plan and purpose, however, the recording of it might well have been regarded as in a high degree important, if not essential, for it was the last and greatest of the *σημεῖα*. To have omitted this miracle from his narrative would have been to leave the proof *from the works*, as presented to his readers, without that which would give it its greatest emphasis and its most convincing force. The very apprehension of the Jewish rulers respecting the influence of this miracle may give us some measure of its value to the mind of one who, as an eye and ear witness of the history, was familiar with all the facts, as he was presenting the proofs of the truth to the minds of others. With the record of it, his argument from the "works" reaches its climax.—4. As to particular words and phrases in vv. 1-16, the following points may be noticed:—(a) The prepositions *ἀπό* and *ἐκ* seem to be used in ver. 1, as in i. 45, as substantially equivalent to each other. The same thing seems to be true, in this case, of the verbs *φιλεῖν* and *ἀγαπᾶν* (vv. 3, 5).—(b) The words *ὅτι πρὸς θάνατον* (ver. 4) must refer to the final result, since the resurrection of Lazarus was in the thought of Jesus, though it could not, at this moment, have been in that of His disciples.—(c) If ver. 5 is to be regarded, with Meyer, as having a parenthetical character, in so far as the *οὖν* of ver. 6 is connected with ver. 4, the force of this *οὖν* and of vv. 6, 7 is best explained as showing how the action of Jesus was guided by the thought of pro-

moting the glory of God in this case. If, on the other hand, as would seem, more probably, to be the correct view, the *obv* refers back to ver. 5, the explanation given by Westcott may be regarded as the best one. He says: "The delay and the return were alike consequences of the same Divine affection and of the same Divine knowledge. Because the Lord loved the family, He went at the exact moment when His visit would be most fruitful, and not just when He was invited."—(*l*) The thought of ver. 9 is most simply taken as indicating that the danger suggested by the disciples was not to be apprehended—the appointed time for His work was not yet ended ; and ver. 10 serves to strengthen this thought by intimating that it is only after the appointed time is over that the danger comes. Godet's explanation of ver. 10 as meaning, "If I were to seek to prolong my career by refusing to go where duty calls, a real danger would attend my course," and thus as referring to the desire of the disciples that He should remain where He was, though ingenious, appears to be somewhat artificial and improbable.—(*e*) The words of ver. 12 can hardly be explained unless we hold that the disciples were thinking of Jesus as knowing or having heard of the condition of Lazarus, and as intending to go to Bethany for the purpose of miraculously curing his disease. In their eagerness to keep him from the dangers of that region, they seize upon this favorable indication, and press it upon Jesus, without fully understanding or reflecting upon the circumstances in all their bearings. The very difficulty which lies in the way of an altogether satisfactory explanation of their words may even be regarded as showing the reality of the story. Their minds were working, not reflectively and with calmness, but under the influence of anxiety for their Master and with an eagerness for any escape from threatened danger.—(*f*) Ver. 15 answers in its thought to ver. 4, and shows the design of the miracle as related to faith. It will be noticed, also, that the faith is that of the disciples. The last miracle, like the first, has its individual reference to them. But the faith here was far beyond the faith which followed the miracle at Cana ; it was an addition to all the growth from that time to the present.—(*g*) The words of Thomas in ver. 16 point to the apostolic authorship of the book, for a later writer would have felt little interest in recording such a saying, and certainly would have been unlikely to invent it for the purpose of inserting it here.

## XXIII.

Vv. 17-27. 1. The opinion of Godet is probably correct, that the death of Lazarus occurred on the day when the messenger came to Jesus from the sisters, after he had started from Bethany.—2. The persons referred to in ver. 19 must be regarded as belonging to the party of the rulers, because of the usual sense of the term *the Jews* in this Gospel. They were evidently friends of the two sisters, and had come to them for the purpose of consolation. Their minds would seem, therefore, to have been occupied at this time, as far as possible, with other feelings than those of hostility to Jesus.—3. Ver. 22 seems to show that Martha had a hope—probably in view of the other cases which had occurred—that Jesus might now, by the exercise of

miraculous power, raise her brother to life ; and she understands His words in reply as not fulfilling this hope. Jesus then turns her thought to Himself.—4. The words, *I am the resurrection and the life*, find their explanation in what follows. The life into which faith introduces the soul is one which abides ; the believer lives, even though physical death comes ; he lives so truly and permanently that he never has any real experience of death in its deepest meaning ; he lives, even in that he has, so to speak, the principle of the resurrection within himself. Christ is thus the source and animating principle of his inner life and the power which secures the resurrection. The resurrection is, as it were, the development of the life. He calls upon Martha to grasp this truth, and she answers the call with the declaration of her belief that He is the Christ, the Son of God. We have here, certainly, a very near approach to the words of xx. 31 : “ But these are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in His name.”

## XXIV.

Vv. 28–44. 1. There seems to be no sufficient reason to suppose, as many commentators do, that Jesus had bidden Martha to call her sister secretly. She acted probably on her own impulse—possibly because she feared a meeting of Jesus with the Jews, but more probably because of the natural desire that her sister, like herself, might meet the Master more privately. Mary rose as quickly on hearing of His arrival as Martha had moved before, and she said to Him the same words. The differences in the character of the two sisters, which have been often insisted upon, and much to Martha's disadvantage, rest on rather weak foundations, so far as this passage, or even the one in Luke x. 40–42, is concerned.—2. The word *ἐνεβριμήσατο* has troubled all the writers on this Gospel. That the use of the word, outside of the New Testament, is confined to the feeling of anger or indignation, must, apparently, be admitted. It is to be observed, however, that the instances in which it occurs are not very numerous, and that words of this character, expressive of emotion, are those which may, perhaps, more easily than other words, pass into a somewhat wider or looser sense in the progress of a language from age to age. In the present case it is exceedingly difficult to find any satisfactory explanation of the word as meaning anger or indignation. The scene was one of sorrow—the sisters were weeping, Jesus Himself wept, even the Jews were weeping. Anger would seem inconsistent with the occasion. The idea that the tears of the Jews were crocodile tears, which Meyer suggests, is entirely without foundation in the text, and contrary to the whole impression of the apostle's language. The suggestion that His indignation was excited against Satan, as having brought death into the world, is improbable, considering that there is no distinct reference to Satan in the sentence or in the context. This suggestion has all the characteristics of a device made to meet a difficulty. That He was indignant at Himself, or that His divine nature was indignant at His human nature, because He could not restrain His tears,

is a supposition scarcely worthy of mention. That His indignation was aroused by the want or weakness of faith in the sisters is opposed by everything in the story ; their faith was not weak as compared with that of His nearest disciples, and they were full of love to Him. Godet's suggestion, that the sobs of those around Him, pressing Him to raise His friend to life, turned His thought to His own death, and that He was indignant at the diabolical perversity of His enemies, some of whom were present, which would make the act of raising Lazarus a means of bringing about His crucifixion, is, to say the least, remote from any statement made in the verses, and has in it a certain artificiality. How can the author have been supposed to suggest all this to the reader's mind, when he says nothing about it, except in this one quite indefinite word, and when everything points to sorrow and not to indignation ? In view of all the circumstances of the case, it may be seriously questioned whether the change of the word to a slightly different sense—the violent emotion of grief, rather than anger—is not to be supposed, in this passage, as belonging to the later language or the individual writer.—3. Meyer, in accordance with his theory of "crocodile tears," regards the words of ver. 37 as indicating that the *τινές* there spoken of were "maliciously and wickedly disposed to treat Jesus' tears as a welcome proof of His inability" to heal Lazarus. Weiss has a similar view. Godet also. Godet argues for this view from the fact that the expression, *But some of them*, is found in ver. 46 as designating the evil-disposed party, and from the difficulty of discovering otherwise any relation between these words and the new emotion (*ἐμβριμώμενος*) in ver. 38. But the expression *τινές δέ* is one which might be found in any case where there happened to be two divisions, and can prove nothing ; and the emotion of anger (as Godet supposes it to be) has as loose a connection with what precedes in ver. 33, as it would have in ver. 38 if ver. 37 were taken in the favorable sense. The natural sense of ver. 37, as the expression of weeping and sympathizing friends of the sisters, is the favorable one, and there is no indication to the contrary.—4. Meyer finds the "mobile, practical tendency" of Martha, as contrasted with Mary, exhibited here in her words (ver. 39), which indicate a shuddering at the exposure of her brother's body to the gaze of those present. But the most that can be affirmed is, that it was she, and not Mary, who spoke. The reason of her speaking may have been something else than a greater "mobile, practical tendency." The recording of Martha's words here is, no doubt, connected with the author's desire to present the miracle in its greatness ; the glory of God was to be displayed in the most wonderful manner.—5. The simplest explanation of the closing words of ver. 41 is that the requests of Jesus and the answers from the Father are so coincident that the answer anticipates the possibility of utterance in words, and so the utterance becomes a thanksgiving that the prayer is already heard. The relation of the whole action in the case to the production of faith is prominently set forth in this prayer, as well as in the words addressed to Martha in ver. 40

## XXV.

Vv. 45-53. 1. The result of the miracle was the production of the desired faith, not only in the sisters and the disciples, but also in many of the Jews who had come to express their sympathy with Mary. The strict rules of construction make *οἱ ἰθὺότες* the same with *πολλοί*, while *Ἰουδαίων* refers to the whole body usually called the Jews in this Gospel. There is no serious objection to this view of the sentence. If it be adopted, the *αὐτῶν* may refer to the *ἰθὺότες* (Meyer), or it may refer to the *Ἰουδαίων* (Godet). If, on the other hand, *οἱ ἰθὺότες*, by an irregularity, takes the place of *τῶν ἰθὺότεων*, the statement would seem to correspond better with what we might antecedently expect as more probable. The declaration, in that case, is : Many of those Jews who have already been spoken of as coming to Mary believed, but some of them (those who did not believe) went and told the Pharisees. This explanation gives so simple and natural a meaning that it commends itself, if the substitution of the nominative participle can be supposed.—2. The difficulty which has been found by some writers in the fact that Caiaphas is spoken of in ver. 49 as high-priest of that year has no real foundation. The statement is not introduced with reference to Caiaphas, but to Jesus. The man who was high-priest in that remarkable year when Jesus died uttered the prophecy respecting His death.—3. The utterance of Caiaphas is spoken of as a prophecy. This is apparently a kind of figurative expression, by which the author would intimate, not that Caiaphas was inspired of God, but that, in the providential plan respecting Christ, it came to pass that an utterance was made which proved to be prophetic of the immediate future, and was made by the head of the Jewish system.—4. The precise condition of the minds of the Sanhedrim at this time is strikingly exhibited in these verses. They were awakened to see that the policy of inaction or delay would be no longer safe. The influence of Jesus, rapidly becoming greater, was likely to be much increased by this remarkable miracle, and action was necessary on their part, or it might be too late. It was natural that the party favoring more vigorous measures should now succeed in leading the body to commit itself and to begin more seriously and resolutely to work towards effecting the murder of Jesus.—5. The understanding of this prophetic utterance was made known to the author and his fellow-apostles, no doubt, by the events which followed, and the words took their place in the line of testimony—the testimony unconsciously given, in this case, by an enemy—to Christ and His future work.—6. It is noticeable that, while the raising of Lazarus is represented in this chapter as inciting the Jewish authorities to more active and decisive measures, it is not referred to afterwards as constituting an element in the accusation made against Him at His trial. This fact, which has been urged as bearing against the reality of the event and the truthfulness of the story, seems to indicate, on the other hand, the exact relation which the event had to the end. It excited the enemies to action, but it was not the cause of Jesus' death. It was not a matter to be brought forward in the trial, but it was one important circumstance which led to

the hastening of the trial. Moreover, the trial before Pilate was, as Meyer remarks, connected rather with an accusation of a political character ; while that before the Sanhedrim, it may be added, turned more towards a charge of blasphemy.

## XXVI.

## CHAPTER XII.

Vv. 1-11. 1. The question as to the day on which Jesus came to Bethany, and, in connection with this, the day of His entrance into Jerusalem, is a complicated and difficult one, because of the uncertainty respecting the day of the week on which the Jewish Passover took place in this year, and also the uncertainty as to whether the counting of days here is in accordance with the Jewish or the Roman method. According to the most natural impression derived from John's narrative, the Passover occurred on Friday, the day of Jesus' death. According to the Jewish method of reckoning, six days before this would be Sunday. But if xiii. 1 refers to the first day before the Passover, and this was Thursday, the Roman method is adopted by the author, and the sixth day was Saturday. The latter supposition seems more probable. If this be the case, the arrival must have taken place very early in the morning, and from a place in the immediate neighborhood, because it was the Sabbath ; and the supper in Simon's house was given in the evening, after the Sabbath hours had passed. The entrance into Jerusalem, accordingly, was made on Sunday. This is the more common view, and the traditional one of the Church, with respect to the time of the triumphal entry. Godet held this view in his first edition, but in his second and third editions he places the arrival on Sunday and the entrance on Monday.<sup>1</sup>—2. Godet insists that the feast mentioned in ver. 2 was not in the house of the sisters and Lazarus, and Weiss says that the form of expression used respecting the latter shows that he was not the master of the house and giver of the feast. The story of Matthew and Mark represents the feast as having taken place in the house of Simon the leper, and there is nothing in John's narrative, certainly, which is inconsistent with this representation. But it can scarcely be affirmed, with correctness, that the expressions used by John prove that the supper was not given by the sisters and Lazarus. The context in the preceding chapter has presented them as the prominent persons ; no one else is named here ; the verb *ἐποίησαν* is used without an expressed subject, and the subject to be supplied is naturally suggested by the names of these persons. As all the persons are participants in the scene, it was certainly not unnatural (as it might have been, under other circumstances) to say, They made a feast for him, and one of them had one part connected with it, another another, etc.—3. The little detail (ver. 3), *and the house was filled with the odor of*

<sup>1</sup> The translator in several places in Vol. I., though not in all, has used the designation *Palm Sunday* for this day, instead of *Palm-day*. The former expression accords with

usage, but not with the view of Godet, who places the entrance into Jerusalem on Monday. This word of explanation seems to be required, and is accordingly offered here.

*the ointment*, is one of the incidental indications in this Gospel that the author knew the facts because he lived with Jesus. A later writer, evolving a speculative theory from his own musings, would not have thought of inserting such a statement.—4. The word ἐβάσταζεν is taken by R. V. text, Meyer, and many commentators in the sense of *took away, purloined*. This view is supported by the literal meaning of κλέπτῃς, and by the alleged tautology if the sense of *bore* or *carried* is given to the verb. The tautology, however, is not inconsistent with the simple measured style of the Gospels, and the word κλέπτῃς may easily have a certain loose or semi-figurative sense, as pointing to avariciousness displaying itself under such circumstances. That Judas was a thief, on the other hand, in the sense that he actually stole money from the small sum belonging to the company of disciples—often or generally not exceeding about thirty or forty dollars, it would seem, comp. vi. 7 with ver. 5 of the present passage—is a thing nowhere else intimated in the Gospel history, and very difficult to believe. How could he have been tolerated in the company if he was known to be a thief of this low and base order? R. V. marg., A. V., de Wette, Lücke, Ewald, Luthardt and others give the verb the meaning *carried* or *bore*.—5. If the reading ἵνα . . . τηρήσῃ is adopted in ver. 7, the simplest explanation, perhaps, is connected with the supposition that Jesus views the use made of the ointment as, not literally indeed, but in a certain true and deep sense, a keeping it for the embalming of His body. From this twelfth chapter onward to the end of the seventeenth Jesus evidently anticipates His death as if already present, or even as having occurred.—6. The statements of vv. 9–11 show that the place of the story of Lazarus in the narrative is that which has been already indicated. It had a great influence in the way of producing faith, and, on the other hand, in urging forward the chief-priests and Pharisees in their murderous designs. This was all. The rulers did not form their plan in consequence of this event; they had formed it long before. They did not carry it out because of this event; they would have carried it out had there been no such miracle. The results of the miracle—even in the turning away of many of their own party towards faith in Jesus—alarmed them, and made them yield to the bold suggestions of men like Caiaphas.—7. In the development of the narrative as related to the matter of faith, it is interesting to notice that, at the end, the writer brings out so emphatically its presence, even among those who belonged to the bitterly hostile party. The story shows progress in its plan, everywhere and in every line.

## XXVII.

Vv. 12–19. 1. The story of the entrance of Jesus into Jerusalem is given by John with a different purpose from that of the Synoptic writers. The latter relate the story simply as an occurrence in Jesus' life, having indeed the remarkable character which belongs to it, but yet only one among the incidents of the closing part of the history. In John's Gospel it stands, as Godet remarks, between the resurrection of Lazarus (its cause) and the condemna-

tion of Jesus (its effect), as a kind of connecting link to unite the two. We may add : it is also introduced with reference to the matter of faith—this being another instance where the author represents the limitation of the understanding of the disciples before the time when Jesus was glorified. That the account should, in some respects, differ—in the insertion or omission of details—from that which is given by the Synoptics, may afford no occasion for surprise when these considerations are borne in mind. The reference to the entrance as from Bethany is not strange, as the author's desire is to connect the matter with the miracle and the feast which had taken place. Matthew has no such special occasion for alluding to Bethany, but has occasion to speak of Jericho. We may easily believe, as Godet says, that “while the body of the caravan continued its journey to Jerusalem, Jesus and His disciples stopped at Bethany.”—2. The relation of the raising of Lazarus to the great movement of this day is, undoubtedly, set forth with much distinctness and emphasis in this passage ; but, so far as the influence on the final catastrophe is concerned, the point made prominent is, again, the alarm occasioned in the minds of the Pharisees. The very careful and exact manner in which this story is told, as related to all its different bearings, is clearly indicative of an intelligent and deliberate plan on the author's part.

## XXVIII.

Vv. 20–36. 1. The persons called *Ἕλληνας* were undoubtedly Gentiles by birth, but yet Gentiles who had become proselyted Jews, because they went up to celebrate the feast. Whether their request to see Jesus was allowed or not, the narrative does not say. If we may judge from the ordinary readiness of Jesus to meet those who honestly desired to meet Him, we may believe that these representatives of the Gentiles were admitted to His presence. It would seem hardly probable that, after such expressions of His feeling and thought in view of their appearance, He would have refused to speak with them. But the author's plan moves away from this point. He is looking towards testimony and proof, not towards the history or experience of these few men. Hence he turns the reader to what Jesus said, and leaves him with the impression which comes from His words.—2. The glorification of the Son of man which is spoken of in ver. 23 is evidently that which comes through the extending of His kingdom over the world. This is indicated, (a) by the fact that the expression is suggested by the approach of these representatives of the Gentile nations ; (b) by the words of the 24th verse ; (c) by the reference of vv. 31, 32 to the overthrow of Satan and the drawing of all men to Himself. This coming glory is suggested to Him, as if in vision, by the approach of these Greeks, and the future appears as if already realized. The future centred itself in the hour of His death for the world, and this hour is so near that it seems to have already come.—3. The words of vv. 27, 28 correspond somewhat closely with those which were uttered in the garden of Gethsemane. As to the sudden change of feeling indicated by these words as compared with those of vv. 23 ff., the following suggestions may be offered :—(a) The whole passage evidently shows that Jesus

was thinking of His death as close at hand. With this in view, it was natural that two sets of feelings should have risen in His mind—now, of the triumph of His work, which even as a prophet or reformer, far more as the Son of God, He must have had before His thought as He looked forward, in His confidence in the Divine truth, into the future ; and again, of the trial and suffering which were just coming upon Him in the hour of His crucifixion. It would have been strange, indeed, if it had been otherwise.—(b) As the Divine messenger to the world, who was to suffer death for its sins, and, through this suffering, was to accomplish the work of redemption, the existence of these two feelings in His mind is yet more fully explained. And to such a Divine messenger they would come in quick succession and in almost immediate connection with each other, as the end drew near. A similar succession of feeling, though not in such nearness of time, is seen in the discourse on the last things, where the coming of the Son of man in power and great glory is declared, and in the scene in the garden.—4. The omission in this Gospel of the words spoken in Gethsemane, which resemble those recorded here, may be accounted for from the fact that the author's plan made it desirable to bring in this whole matter of Jesus' victorious and sorrowful feeling at the close of that portion of his book which related to His public ministry. Having once presented the matter here, he had no occasion to repeat it afterwards ; and, so far as was related to his plan of proof, etc., the words in Gethsemane were only of the nature of a repetition of what was uttered at this time.—5. The question whether the words *Save me from this hour* are to be taken interrogatively or affirmatively, is one which cannot be decisively answered. If they are understood in the latter way, they correspond more nearly with the words in Gethsemane, *If it be possible, let this cup pass from me ; nevertheless*, etc. For this reason, they seem to the writer of this note to have this construction and meaning. Weiss and Keil take them interrogatively, and the latter writer says that the absence here of the *if it is possible*, and the change from *nevertheless*, etc., in Matthew, to *but for this cause*, etc., here, shows that this cannot be an actual prayer, but must be understood as a question. Milligan and Moulton and Alford give the affirmative sense, as also does Meyer.—6. The words of Meyer respecting the voice from heaven seem conclusive as showing that it was an objective occurrence : “ John himself, who was an ear-witness, describes it as such ; he repeats its express words ; to take the first half of these words referring to the past as the product of a merely subjective perception is without any support in the prayer of Jesus ; Jesus Himself in ver. 30 gives His confirmation to the occurrence of an actual voice ; finally, the ἀγγελοι also, ver. 29, must have heard a *speech*.” Weiss, on the other hand, claims that a voice, the understanding of which depends on spiritual conditions, cannot be a voice of articulate sound. The comparison which Godet makes of the understanding of the human voice by animals and men may, perhaps, be helpful in the way of illustrating this matter ; and the condition of mind in different hearers in many ordinary cases has some influence on what they gain from the voice heard—it may even determine whether they think it to be a voice or a mere sound.—7. In vv. 30, 31 Jesus rises again to the con-

temptation of the success and triumph of the future. The judgment of the world and the casting of its prince out of his power and dominion seem to His mind to be accomplished, since His death, now at hand, makes it certain that these things will come to pass ; and He looks forward to the ingathering of all men into His kingdom. The reference here is probably to the last times, when the Gospel shall be triumphant everywhere, when Jews and Gentiles alike shall be saved (Rom. xi. 25, 26). Towards this consummation the movement would be constant from the day of Christ's death and resurrection and of the outpouring of the Spirit.—8. The writer explains the words *be lifted up* as referring to the manner of Jesus' death—thus, to His crucifixion. It was the hour of His death which was ever before Jesus' mind at this time. But in the idea of His death we may believe that all was included which belonged with it as essential to His great work—namely, His resurrection and ascension and the descent of the Holy Spirit.—9. In His answer to the people in ver. 35 f. Jesus once more calls their minds to Himself as the light, and seems to say that, by putting themselves in connection with the light while it still lingers with them in His personal presence, and thus becoming sons of light, they will discover for themselves, after His removal, how He can be lifted up, and yet can be the Christ who abides forever.

#### XXIX.

Vv. 37-50. 1. The writer closes this first great division of his work with a declaration of the failure and success of the miracles of Jesus, so far as the matter of faith in the case of the hostile party was concerned—as, at the end of the book, he sets forth his purpose and hope with reference to the recording of them for all his readers. The *σημεία* had been abundant, but this party would not believe.—2. This unbelief is connected in two ways with the prophetic words uttered by Isaiah—first, as a fulfilment of what he said, and, secondly, as finding its foundation or cause in another statement of his. The two prophetic statements are those declared to have been made in view of the time of Christ. The first and third of these points (ver. 38 and ver. 41) may be explained in connection with the general view which the New Testament writers had of the Old Testament. They found its whole meaning in Christ, and they thus carried Him, as it were, into every part or sentence of it which corresponded with His experience or work. Their view, in the truest and deepest sense, perchance, was the right one. But the special difficulty here lies in connection with the second point (vv. 39, 40). The explanation of this point must, apparently, involve two things—first, the responsibility of the individual, which limits the inability to what is moral, and, secondly, the Divine activity, which must be of the nature of a judicial hardening. The literal interpretation of the words, when pressed to its utmost extreme, is contradicted by the general representations of the New Testament respecting the sinfulness of men.—3. The exception mentioned in ver. 42 is apparently presented as showing the success which Jesus had gained, notwithstanding the failure just described, and in connection with all that has been said in these later

chapters respecting the rulers. The persons here alluded to do not seem to be such as Nicodemus or Joseph of Arimathea, nor such as Gamaliel. The two former were, probably, not actuated by the motive indicated in ver. 43. The last, as Meyer remarks, "did not get as far as faith."—The word *δόξα* of ver. 43 means the glory *which comes* from men or from God.

—4. As to the passage vv. 44–50, it is generally held by the recent commentators to be a sort of summary of the teachings of Jesus as given in the foregoing chapters, just as the preceding verses have presented a kind of summation of the results of His work. This is quite probably, though not indeed certainly, the correct view. The verses are introduced as if they might be a new discourse, and yet no occasion or mark of time is given. The thoughts and expressions are, to say the least, more strikingly similar to what has been said before than is the case with any other discourse, and no new idea is presented. The position of the verses also—following the summing up of results—favors the view that they are a *résumé* of the teachings, rather than a new discourse; and, on the whole, this view of them is to be adopted.—5. The thoughts of this passage follow each other in the natural order:—Faith in Jesus brings the soul into union with God; the object of the coming of Jesus into the world is to bring the light of God, that the soul of the believer may dwell in the light-life which has no darkness, the life like God's life; as Jesus thus comes to save the world, and not to judge it, He gives forth His teachings, which have been committed to Him by the Father, and they determine the judgment; these teachings which are given to Him as His Divine commission are eternal life, in that, being received by faith, they become the source of eternal life to the soul; in the proclamation of these teachings Jesus speaks in exact accordance with the Father's communication of His will and of His truth.—The thoughts contained in these verses, in the completeness of their setting forth of His message, as well as in the fact that the passage gathers into itself only what has been said in different places before, seem to be the summary of what He gave to the world in this earlier portion of this Gospel.

—6. It is worthy of notice that at this point the *σημεία*, so far as they are found in the sphere of *miraculous works*, cease to be recorded. What remains of the book contains only the *σημεία* which pertain to the region of the *words* of Jesus. The works are the primary and lower proofs, to the view of this writer; the words are of the higher order. The former are designed to arrest the attention of the world and to bear upon the earlier development of faith. The latter are adapted to the thoughtful and growing disciples, whose minds open more and more widely to the truth. Just in accordance with this character and purpose of the two kinds of evidence, we find that, when the conflict with the world and the public ministry of Jesus come to their end, and the disciples have been growing in the fulness of their belief even to the last days, the outward miracles are no longer mentioned, and the discourses of intimate friendship and love, as between Christ and His Father and the followers of Christ, begin. How can it be fitly said that this Gospel has no progress, or that it ends at its beginning?

## XXX.

## CHAPTER XIII.

Whatever view may be taken of the details of the plan of this Gospel, there can be no doubt that there is a new and marked turn in the narrative at the beginning of this chapter—the events of the last evening and the last day of Jesus' life being now considered. At the opening of this new division of the work we find a designation of time, *πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα*, and the record of what occurred at a supper in which the Lord and His disciples participated. The position of these words would, in itself, seem to indicate that the author's design was to mark by means of them the date of the occasion which he is about to describe. The same thing seems to be clearly indicated by the prominence given to the words in the verse to which they belong, and the relation of this verse to those which immediately follow. That verse 1 is a complete sentence, of which *ἠγάπησεν* is the principal verb, is beyond question; that vv. 2-5 form another sentence, which is closely connected (*καί*) with ver. 1, is equally clear. The nature of the first sentence (a declaration as to the feeling of the heart: *loved*), as related to that of the second (the setting forth of an act manifesting this feeling), proves this connection. Such a general proposition respecting love, independently of any relation to the act of love, would be uncalled for and unnatural in this place. We may say, therefore, with much confidence, that the progress of the discourse here shows the connection of the words "before the feast of the Passover" to be with the verb *loved*, and, through that verb, with the leading verbs of vv. 2-5. The thought of the verses, when taken together, is accordingly this: Before the feast of the Passover Jesus showed that He loved His disciples, by performing the act described.

That this is the true view of the connection of *πρὸ κ.τ.λ.*, as related to the first verse considered by itself, is rendered altogether probable by the following considerations: 1. That the emphasis given to these words by their position in the sentence is most easily accounted for if they qualify the leading verb; indeed, it can hardly be satisfactorily explained otherwise.—2. That there are serious, or even insuperable objections in the way of connecting them with either of the participial words. These words are *εἰδώς* and *ἀγαπήσας*. The connection with the latter is not to be admitted, because the placing of the words before *εἰδώς* would lead the reader to unite them with that participle, if with either of the two; and that with the former must be rejected, because no satisfactory reason can be given for calling attention, in this subordinate clause, to the circumstance that Jesus knew the fact mentioned before the feast, while every reason which the nature of the case allows makes such a designation of time as related to the leading verb appropriate.

The act which is described, therefore, and thus the supper at which the act was performed, took place at the time marked by the expression *πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα*. That this supper is the one in connection with which

the Lord's Supper was instituted is indicated by the fact that it was evidently on the same evening (the evening before Jesus' death), and by the fact that the words respecting the betrayal by Judas and the denials by Peter, which in the Synoptics are placed in close connection with the time of instituting the Lord's Supper, are connected with this occasion. The Lord's Supper is, accordingly, declared here to have taken place before the feast of the Passover.

The phrase which marks the date is somewhat doubtful in its meaning. Meyer, Weiss and others, who hold that the Supper was on the 13th, admit that this verse does not determine the question. Our passage, says Meyer, does not state *how long* before the feast. It is noticeable, indeed, that there is no indication that the event occurred *one* day before the Passover, as in the case of ch. xii. 1 *six* days. When we consider, however, 1, that John's dates are usually given with reference to a distance of one time from another, unless the identity of time is distinctly stated; 2, that this is the case in xii. 1, where the first of the designations of time connected with the closing days of Jesus' life is found; 3, that the supper, if occurring on the evening of the 14th, was so closely connected with and conceived of as the Passover supper, that a dividing of the time so as to make prominent the part which preceded the actual eating of the lamb, etc., would seem improbable; 4, that if the feast, as Godet thinks, included the whole of the 14th, the words before the feast must, strictly interpreted, carry us back to the evening of the 13th,—we may admit that the probability of the case lies, at least in some degree, on the side of giving to *πρό* the sense of *a day before*. If, therefore, the later passages of this Gospel which bear upon this question are found to point more probably towards the 13th than the 14th as the evening of the Supper, this verse may be regarded as strengthening, rather than otherwise, the evidence which they give.

The expression *εις τέλος*, which is taken by Meyer as meaning *at the end* or *at last*, by Godet as meaning *completely, in the highest degree, to the uttermost*, and by Weiss as possibly having either of these significations, but probably the latter, is understood by R. V. text, as by de W., Alf., Winer and others, in the sense of *to the end*. The possibility of this last sense is admitted by Godet, and is proved by Matt. x. 22 and the parallels. The objection urged against it by Godet in this place—that it was unnecessary to say that Jesus did not cease to love His own until the moment when He died for them—seems not to be well founded. We should know, indeed, that Jesus loved His disciples, because of His actions, even if the evangelists had nowhere stated the fact. But this does not make such a statement on their part idle or unnatural. In the present case, the writer of the Fourth Gospel had reached a point where he was to leave behind him the story of the public ministry of Jesus, and turn to the description of His last hours and His parting interview with His disciples. What could be more natural, and more expressive of the feeling which John had in the remembrance of that final meeting, than to say that, having loved His own who were in the world all through His life with them, He now showed that His love for them continued to the end, by an act which love alone could have dictated. The

tendency of the most recent writers seems to be towards a rejection of this view (so Westcott, Moulton, Keil, Grimm). The meaning *at the end*, however, is, so far as the New Testament is concerned, doubtful, to say the least. Luke xviii. 5, if the rendering of A. V. and R. V. is correct in that passage, as Godet himself allows in his Com., on Luke that it may be, is not an instance in proof of this meaning, but rather of *to the end*; and 1 Thess. ii. 16, to which Meyer makes reference, is to be interpreted as signifying *to the uttermost*. This last signification is objected to by Meyer in the present verse, and with some reason, it would seem, notwithstanding that Weiss denies it, on the ground that it involves "an inappropriate gradation, as though Jesus had now exercised His love to the utmost." It is doubtful whether we can properly say that this was the utmost exhibition of love which He ever made before His death. Moreover, the contrast of ἀγαπήσας and ἠγάπησεν, together with the time element in the sentence, seems to point towards a continuance of the love, which had covered the whole of the past life, even to the end. The interpretation of R. V. text, therefore, appears to be the simplest and best. R. V. marg. reads *to the uttermost*.

The act of washing the disciples' feet appears, from the explanatory suggestions of ver. 12 ff., to have been intended, so far as its lesson of instruction was concerned, to teach humility. We learn from Luke xxii. 24 ff. that at the supper there was a contention among the apostles as to which of them was to be accounted the greatest. This fact might seem to give a very natural occasion for an action on Jesus' part of the character here described by John. If the supper alluded to in the two Gospels was the same—and the evidence for this is satisfactory—we can hardly separate the two things. But if they are not to be separated, the contention spoken of by Luke must have preceded the act of Jesus, not only because it would so easily have suggested the act, but especially because, after the performance of such an act by Jesus, it is almost impossible to suppose that the apostles could have engaged in such a contention.—This action of Jesus thus had a twofold significance: it taught the lesson of humility and the serving character of Christian love, and it revealed, in a very striking way, the love which Jesus had for these chosen friends. In accordance with his constant thought of the inward life and of what Jesus was for the soul, John centres his words upon the latter point alone. He makes the testimony of love, wonderful as it was in this last day of Jesus' life, a testimony to what Jesus was as the Christ, the Son of God, and the source of eternal life to the believer.

### XXXI.

With reference to the individual words and phrases of vv. 1-11 the following suggestions may be offered: 1. The *hour*, which has been spoken of in the earlier part of the Gospel as not yet come, is here, as in xii. 23, referred to as already present. In connection with this fact, it may be noticed that, in the discourses of this last evening, Jesus seems often to speak as if the final moment were already past, and He was at the hour which immediately followed His death.—2. The fact of the absence of the article

before *δείπνου* does not prove that the supper in question was not the Passover supper, but it is to be admitted that this fact is more easily accounted for if it was a supper on another evening. The word "necessarily," which Godet uses, seems hardly to be justified.—3. Godet holds that *ιδώς* of ver. 3 is not to be understood, with Meyer, Weiss and others, as meaning *although* He knew, but *because* He knew. It seems to the writer of this note that the view of Meyer, etc., is more probably correct. The greatness of the love manifested in this condescending act is shown in the fact that it was done when, on the one side, Jesus was conscious that Judas, who was one of the company, was resolved to betray Him, and, on the other, when He was assured that all things had been given to Him by the Father. Notwithstanding the presence of the traitor—may we not also say: the contention among the apostles, which showed their earthly-mindedness—and notwithstanding His knowledge that His work and His time of humiliation were ended and His glorification was at hand, He did this service of love. It was in this way that He taught most impressively and effectively the lesson of humility.—4. Westcott presses the distinction between *ἐξῆλθεν ἀπὸ θεοῦ* which is found here, and *ἐξῆλθον ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ* in viii. 42—the former marking *separation*, and the latter *source*. In his note on viii. 42 he calls attention to the same point, and also to the use of the verb with *παρά* as emphasizing the idea of the personal fellowship of the Father and the Son (xvi. 27). The use of the three prepositions is, certainly, worthy of special notice, and the distinction in their meaning, as connected with the many indications of the union between the Son and the Father, points strongly towards, if indeed it does not prove, the correctness of Westcott's view of *ἐξῆλθον ἐκ*, as setting forth the true divinity of the Son. In the present verse the idea is rather of the mission of the Son than of His nature or origin—He came from God, and is now going to Him, and, in connection with His accomplished work, the Father gives all things into His hands.—5. The position of Peter at the table and the question whether Jesus came to him first cannot be determined from ver. 6. Ver. 24 would seem to show that he did not sit next to John, and also that he did not sit next to Jesus on the other side, but that he was at some other part of the table, where the indication by signs would be easier and more natural. If any inference can be drawn from the word *ἐρχεται*, it will be rather against than in favor of the idea that Jesus began with Peter.—6. The explanation which is given in the following verses shows that the words of Jesus addressed to Peter have a bearing upon the Christian life, and do not refer to a mere agreement in feeling at the moment. The act of Jesus, while teaching humility, also taught the need of cleansing the life from the remaining tendencies to evil; and the refusal to accept the act (as would be understood in the light of the higher knowledge, which would come with the spiritual revelation) was, in reality, the putting oneself outside of the true idea of that life. The words of ver. 10 suggest the thought of the passage in this view of it.—7. The turn of the thought in ver. 10 from the individual to the company is easily explained in connection with the deep impression of the approaching act of Judas, which all the Gospels show to have been resting on the mind of Jesus at this time. This turn of thought would scarcely

have entered the mind of a later writer—it belongs to the life of the remembered scene. The explanatory words of ver. 11 also point to an apostolic author, for, as Westcott remarks, these words are natural if the recollection of the writer “carries him back to the time when” they “arrested the attention before they were fully intelligible;” but “no one who had always been familiar with the whole history would have added them.”

## XXXII.

Vv. 12–20. 1. The explanation of the act performed by Jesus which is here given evidently points towards humility, and thus is easily connected with the dispute among the disciples, recorded by Luke, as to which of them was the greatest. But ver. 10 shows that this humility in the matter of service was to be manifested in the way of mutual help in purifying and perfecting the Christian life of all.—2. The example of Jesus, alluded to in ver. 15, must accordingly be taken in this fulness of meaning; the act was primarily one of humility, but secondarily one of cleansing, and the former had its purpose and end in the latter.—3. At ver. 18 there is again a turn to the case of Judas. The word *ἐξελεξάμην* refers apparently to the choice of Judas as one of the apostolic company. The *ὅτι* clause points to this choice as connected with the Divine plan, and thus indicates the explanation of it which was suggested in the notes on the sixth chapter. Jesus adds here, for the first time, what is repeated afterwards, that a part of His design in this last conversation with the disciples was to prepare them for the great surprises and trials which were about to come upon them in the immediate future, and to make these things become thereby a means, not of shaking or destroying their faith, but, on the other hand, of strengthening it.—4. The connection and meaning of this verse are most simply explained if it is made to follow directly upon the last clause which precedes it. They were to go forward in their mission, after His departure from them, in the power and with the message of faith in Him. This faith in Him was to unite every one who had it with God Himself. Their mission, therefore, was to be carried out, with the sustaining power of the assurance that the one who, in receiving them, received Him, would also receive God in and through Him. All this was to be involved in their belief (*ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι*) that Jesus was in reality what He had proclaimed Himself to be.

## XXXIII.

Vv. 21–30. 1. The words at the beginning of ver. 20, *ἐπαράχθη τῷ πνεύματι*, show how the mind of Jesus was, at this time, filled with the thought of the betrayal, and thus how natural it was for Him to allude to Judas in the earlier verses.—2. The external evidence seems, on the whole, to be favorable to the reading *εἶπε τις ἔστιν* in ver. 24. If this text is adopted, it may imply a supposition on Peter's part that John had been already informed as to the one whom Jesus referred to, or it may be understood as meaning that he should inquire of Jesus, and then make it known. It would seem

probable that, if they all asked the question indicated in Matthew xxvi. 22, it must have been just before what is recorded in ver. 24 of John's account.—3. The entering of Satan into Judas, which is here mentioned, must mean something more than the words "having put it into the heart," which are found in ver. 2. The receiving of the ψωμίον was, it may be believed, the deciding-point in the history of Judas' betrayal. After this act he was completely under the power of the evil spirit. By accepting this offering of friendship, and then going forth to carry out the designs of the enemies, he really at this moment betrayed the Son of man with a kiss.—4. Whether John includes himself when he says "No one knew," ver. 28, is uncertain; but, as the purpose of Jesus appears to have been to speak only obscurely, it seems not improbable that he does. The form of expression in these verses would appear to indicate that a part of the company had no explanation at all to suggest with respect to the words spoken by Jesus to Judas, while a part thought of two possible explanations.—5. The bearing of ver. 29 on the question of the evening of the supper is not decisive. The sacred character of the Passover supper and of the evening on which it was celebrated renders it improbable that any one would leave, or be expected to leave the company before the feast, or that purchases would be made on that night. Moreover, we know that some preparations for this supper with the disciples were made two days before the Passover, and it would seem as if others of the kind indicated here would not have been left until the last moment. On the other hand, it is claimed that, if this was the evening of the 13th, there was a whole day before the Passover meal, and consequently there was no need for haste. Weiss urges, in answer to this, that the disciples may not have thought of Judas as about to go out immediately, but the story apparently indicates that their thought was connected with his hasty departure.—The expression *for the feast* favors the view that the Paschal supper had not yet come, and yet not decisively, for the word may be used to designate that which followed the first evening.—On the whole, this verse, like ver. 1, is reconcilable with either view, but the argument in both cases turns slightly towards the 13th as the date of this supper of Jesus and His disciples.—6. The Lord's Supper is probably to be placed after the departure of Judas. This accords with the order of the narrative as given in Matthew and Mark; it is most easily reconciled with the progress of John's narrative as compared with the others; and Luke, in this case as in some others, can easily be understood as not making the exact order of time a matter of special importance. Luke places the dispute as to who should be regarded as the greatest immediately after the institution of the Supper—a thing which seems to be almost impossible. It would appear antecedently probable, also, that as Jesus knew that Judas would leave the company, He would wait until he had gone before He instituted the memorial feast and began the discourse of intimate friendship. If the institution of the Supper follows ver. 30, it may be best placed between this verse and ver. 31, or before ver. 31.

## XXXIV.

Vv. 31-38. 1. The departure of Judas, leaving Jesus alone with His faithful disciples, turns His thoughts again to the glory and triumph awaiting Him, comp. xii. 23, but now both to the earthly (ver. 31) and the heavenly glory (ver. 32). A participation in this heavenly glory will be given to His followers also, but it cannot be now. In the intermediate period, while they were to be still on earth and in the midst of the unbelieving world, they would need some new uniting power to take the place, as it were, of His own personal presence. This power was to be in their love to one another. At this moment, and by the giving of the new commandment, Jesus seems, in a certain sense, to have formed the disciples into the Christian Church, as it was to exist on earth after His death.—2. The explanation of the new commandment is to be discovered in connection with this fact. The command consists, it may be said, of two elements—*love and one another*. The newness of it cannot lie in *love*, for this command had belonged to the earlier teaching of Christ, and even of the Old Testament. It must, therefore, lie in the words *one another*. But these words, both because of the circumstances in which they were spoken and of the fact that, as related to men in general, they were not new, must have reference to the Christian company. The love enjoined is, accordingly, that which belongs to the membership of this company. Every member is to love every other member because of the common love of Christ to both. The measure of this love is indicated in the words as *I have loved you*, but this measure cannot be that of the absolute greatness of the love, for the capacities of Christ in this regard are beyond those of the disciples. The love to be exercised, we may also say, cannot be explained as the same in degree in all cases, for Christ did not love all the eleven disciples in equal degree. But He loved according to the possibilities of His nature, as affected by the circumstances of each case, and the disciples are, in like manner, to love one another according to the possibilities of their nature as affected by similar circumstances. This love, which was founded upon the common bond to the common Lord, was to be a power also upon the world, leading the world to know that they were His disciples, and thus turning the thoughts of the world to Him.—3. The conversation respecting Peter's denials is represented here, quite evidently, as having taken place in the supper-room, for we cannot at all suppose that they went out from the room before xiv. 31, if, indeed, they did before xviii. 1. Luke xxii. 31 ff. also places the conversation before the departure from the room. On the other hand, Matthew and Mark place it after the departure and when they were on the way to the Mount of Olives. Meyer thinks that the conversation may have been twice repeated, in whole or in part, but such a repetition within the space of two or three hours seems quite improbable. It is more probable that the earlier Gospels have disregarded the exact order of time here.

## XXXV.

## CHAPTER XIV.

Vv. 1-11. 1. The discourse which occupies the fourteenth chapter is apparently suggested by the thought expressed in xiii. 36 : "Thou canst not follow me now, but thou shalt follow me afterwards." The announcement of His approaching death, which Jesus had given to His disciples, and all things that had come before their minds in the recent days, had filled them with surprise and grief. They were bewildered, as well as sorrowful. The thought of His death and separation came upon them with terrible suddenness, for they had not comprehended His meaning when He had spoken to them previously of the fate which He was to meet. The words addressed to Peter were really addressed to them all, and they needed strength and support in view of the coming separation. To this end Jesus now speaks, and He presents to their minds, in this chapter, three grounds of consolation and encouragement :—first, the promise of a future reunion with Him in Heaven (vv. 1-11) ; secondly, the assurance of great success in their work for Him after His departure (vv. 12-14) ; thirdly, the promise of the Holy Spirit as a Helper (vv. 15-24). The last two points relate to what would be experienced by them in their future earthly life ; the first, to what would come after its ending. But this which refers to the remoter future is placed at the beginning, because it was the first thing which they needed for their comfort as they heard the words, You cannot follow me now ; you must wait until a future time. That their hearts might not be troubled, they must have the certainty of that future.

2. The two verbs πιστεύετε are probably imperatives : "Believe in God and believe in me." This confidence in God and in Jesus Himself was that which would raise their hearts above trouble. The positive demand thus stands in contrast with the negative. For the understanding of this chapter and those which immediately follow, the standpoint which Jesus takes should be carefully noticed. He seems clearly to assume the position of one who has come from His own home to a foreign land for a temporary sojourn and work there. While there, in the midst of this work, He has formed intimate and tender friendships with certain friends. The time has now come for Him to return to His home. They have still to remain where they are, continuing the work which He has begun, but His part of it, as Himself personally present among them, is ended. After a time their work also will be finished, and then they may follow Him. Now, as such a friend, at such a moment, He says to them : I am going back to my Father's house and to leave you alone ; but do not let your hearts be distressed by this ; on the other hand, have confidence in my Father and in me, that in the end all will be well.

3. The assurance given with regard to the future reunion contains three elements :—the declaration that there is room enough for all in the Father's house, the statement that He is going thither to prepare a place for the disciples, and the promise that He will come again and take them to Himself,

Two points of special interest may be noticed in vv. 2, 3, which present this assurance :—(a) The evidence which is incidentally involved in the words, “If it were not so, I would have told you,” that the book is written from the remembered personal experience of the author as one of the apostolic company. On this point see Vol. I., pp. 508, 509. (b) The word *ἐρχομαι* of ver. 3. To what does this refer? Four answers have been given to this question. In the first placé, the verb has been supposed to refer to the Parousia. In this sense it is possibly or probably used in xxi. 23. The objection to this view is that which Godet suggests—namely, that the event was too remote to offer the consolation which they needed. It would have been like the thought of the final resurrection to the mind of Martha, when she desired to have her brother presently restored to her. The disciples did not live to see the Parousia; and that event is even yet in the future.—In the second place, it has been referred to the return of Jesus to the disciples at His resurrection. But He did not take them to heaven then, nor receive them to any permanent reunion with Him.—Thirdly, it has been understood in the sense of *ἐρχομαι* of ver. 18, and as referring to the coming of Christ to His followers in and through the Holy Spirit. But evidently, according to the statement of ver. 23, the coming there referred to is a spiritual coming of Christ to be with the believer where the latter is—that is, on earth, and not a coming to take the believer to be with Christ where He is—that is, in heaven.—A fourth reference has been given by some writers—namely, a return of Christ at the death of each believer, to receive him to Himself. The objection to this view is founded upon the fact that this sense of *ἐρχομαι* is not found elsewhere, either in this Gospel or in the rest of the New Testament writings. The writer of this note would suggest, however, the possibility of explaining the matter in connection with the position taken by Jesus in these discourses (see 2 above). May not the return, the coming again, be used here, not in its ordinary or technical sense, but in connection with the *figurative representation*, as it may be called, of the whole discourse? As the departing friend goes back to the house of his father and prepares a place for those whom he leaves behind, in order that they may have a home there when the time appointed shall arrive, and as he then returns to take them with him to his home, so Jesus here says that, at the end of the work of each one of His disciples, He will come, as the friend comes, and receive them to Himself. The coming thus belongs to the figure, and may be properly used in this sense because of the figure. In this way the reference may be to the death of each believer, without assuming a new *technical* sense of the words *to come again*.

4. The word *ὁδόν* of ver. 4, if interpreted by the preceding context, will naturally mean the way of *death* by which Jesus went to His Father's house. If interpreted by the following context, it will mean Jesus Himself or faith in Him. The more probable interpretation would seem to the writer of this note to be the former. The following words of Jesus turn the mind of Thomas to the way for *him* to reach the Father—thus directing the inquirer away from the point on which he was curious to inquire to a spiritual suggestion or teaching for himself which lay near to his question. We see

many examples of this kind in John's Gospel.—5. In ver. 6 Jesus says, "I am the way"—that is, He is the one through whom (*δὲ ἐμοῦ*, at the end of the verse) the soul comes to the Father. He then adds, "and the truth and the life." These words set forth, what has been declared in substance in earlier chapters of the Gospel, that in Jesus is the full revelation of the Divine truth and of the eternal life. In the sense in which the words are here used, and according to the thought now before the mind, Jesus is the way because in Him is the truth and the life.—6. Philip asks for some special manifestation of God beyond what had been given them—perhaps he did not himself have a definite idea as to what it should be. In answer to his request, Jesus points to the two great proofs of His being Himself the manifestation of God, which have been presented throughout the Gospel—the *words* and the *works*—and places them again in their right order, the *words* first, and, if these fail to convince, then the *works*. That the expression "believe me that I am in the Father and the Father in me" refers to the *words* as evidence, can hardly be questioned.—7. Vv. 7-11 have somewhat of a transition character, as leading the way from vv. 4-6 to ver. 12 ff. But the connection of their general thought with that of ver. 6 gives them a more special relation to the preceding context, and, in dividing the chapter into its sections, they may properly be assigned to the first section, which thus extends from ver. 1 to ver 11.

## XXXVI.

Vv. 12-14. 1. The word *μείζονα* is not improbably to be taken as an independent neuter adjective ; but, whether thus taken or as agreeing with, an *ἔργα* to be supplied, it must be understood as having a more extended meaning than the *ἔργα* of the previous clause. The miracles wrought by the apostles were not greater than those which Christ performed. The reference here is to the success which they would have in their work as preachers of the Gospel in the extending of the Divine kingdom.—2. The verb *ποιήσω* of ver. 13 is probably to be joined immediately with *πορεύομαι* of ver. 12, and made, like the latter verb, dependent on *ἔτι*. The grounds of assurance of their success are: that He is going to the Father (His exaltation to heaven), and that, in connection with and as resulting from this, their prayers will be answered. Whether this is the true construction of the passage or not, however, the close union of the sentences shows that the answer to prayers here referred to is that which is connected with the labors of the apostles in the carrying forward of the Messianic work. With regard to these prayers two points must be noticed :—first, that they are in the name of Christ, and, secondly, that they are in the line of spiritual things. The idea that every prayer of every individual believer will certainly be answered by a granting of the particular request which is made, is one which is not set forth in the New Testament, and one which would make the mind of the petitioner determine the order of events. The Christian idea of prayer cannot be inconsistent with the submission of all requests to the will of God ; infinite, not finite wisdom must govern the world.

## XXXVII.

Vv. 15-24. 1. The meaning of the word παράκλητος has been much discussed. It is evidently founded upon the verb παρακαλεῖν as a verbal adjective, and the fundamental sense of the word is *called to one's side*, or *aid*. That it has, in the classical usage, the special sense of *advocate*—that is, of a person called to one's aid in this particular line—is to be admitted. This is also the meaning of the word in 1 John ii. 1. But there is nothing in the word itself which necessarily limits it to this signification. Certainly, the offices of the Spirit as they are set forth in these chapters must be considered in determining the idea of Jesus as He used the word. Bishop Lightfoot, in his essay on the Revision of the English Version of the New Testament, claims that the word *advocate* answers to these offices. It seems to the writer of this note, on the other hand, that this is the one idea which is not presented in these chapters. Jesus is set forth by John in the first Epistle (ii. 1) as the advocate, acting for the believer. But while the relation of the Spirit as a helper, a teacher, even a comforter, is brought out by the different statements of these chapters, that of advocate does not seem to be set forth. The designation, Spirit of *truth*, xiv. 16, the words "He shall *teach* you all things," xiv. 26, the statement that He is to *bear witness* of Christ, xv. 26, are descriptive of a teacher, not of a legal advocate. The declaration that He shall convince or convict the world, xvi. 7, is not of such convincing as specially belongs to an advocate, but the figure is rather of one who is carrying on a discussion with another, and who in the discussion convinces the other of the error of his view and the correctness of his own. Lightfoot claims that Paul has the same idea in Rom. viii. 16, 26; but it would seem that, when the Spirit bears witness with our spirits that we are children of God, He is fulfilling another function than that of an advocate; and even when He is spoken of as helping us in our infirmities by making intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered, it is questionable whether the idea of advocate includes all that is meant. The Spirit, Jesus says, would teach them, would lead them into the knowledge of the truth, would declare to them things which were to come, would take of the things of Christ and make them known to the disciples, would aid them in their work of bearing witness to the truth, would so take the place which He had Himself filled as to manifest to them His love and the Father's love, and, in this way, keep them from a state of orphanage, would give them an abiding joy. But all this is the work of a teacher, or a comforter and strengthener. The word Helper belongs to the fundamental meaning of the word, and includes the different ideas which are suggested in the several verses of chs. xiv.-xvi. It may be observed, also, that the discourse which Jesus is here giving is one of consolation with reference to His approaching departure from them. The Spirit is to fill for them the place which He had been filling. He was to be ἄλλος παράκλητος. But the place which Jesus had specially filled thus far was that of helping, teaching, comforting, strengthening, rather than that of the advocate.

2. The word ἐρχομαι, in ver. 18, from its immediate connection with

what is said of the Spirit, as well as from the following context, must be regarded as referring to the coming of Christ to the disciples *in and through the coming of the Spirit*. There can be but little doubt that this passage, and the verses of the sixteenth chapter, which follow the statements respecting the Spirit (xvi. 16 ff.), have the same reference, and are to be explained in connection with each other. These passages are inconsistent with the idea of the return for the period of the forty days following the resurrection of Jesus, because of the permanency of His abiding with the disciples which they suggest. They are also inconsistent with the idea of the second coming, because the indications both of ch. xiv. and ch. xvi. are that Christ is not to be personally with the disciples during the period here alluded to. This latter reason also bears against the reference to the forty days.—The sense of the verb *ἔρχομαι* in this verse is thus peculiar, differing from any use of the verb which we find elsewhere. As it is contrasted with the idea of orphanage or bereavement, the suggestion of the word seems to be connected with the figure of the departing friend which has been spoken of as lying at the basis of the entire discourse. In this view of the matter, the peculiar use of *ἔρχομαι* in this verse may serve to show that the explanation suggested with regard to its meaning in ver. 3 may be the correct one.

3. The evidence that the *μικρόν* of ver. 19 and the corresponding passage in ch. xvi. refer forward to the time of the coming of the Spirit is as follows :—(a) that it is described as a time when the world will not see Christ, and when the disciples alone will behold Him, and they apparently with a spiritual sight, not with the bodily eye (vv. 19b, 20) ; (b) that the manifestation made to the disciples will be a manifestation of love and an abiding of God and Christ with the disciples, not of the disciples with God and Christ (vv. 21–24) ; (c) that the new sight is connected with the fact of Jesus' departure to the Father (xvi. 17) ; (d) that it is to be a state of permanent joy, as contrasted with what was temporary, like the forty days (xvi. 20–22) ; (e) that it is apparently described as a period of communion with the Divine Being through prayer, as distinguished from personal intercourse with Jesus ; (f) these evidences are to be considered in connection with the fact that, in both chapters, the whole passage immediately follows the promise of the coming of the Spirit.

## XXXVIII.

Vv. 25–31. 1. The phrase *ταῦτα λελάληκα* is repeated several times in these chapters, and evidently refers, in each case, to the entire section which precedes. Here, the reference is to the whole discourse of this chapter. After presenting the three grounds of consolation and encouragement, Jesus closes with a few parting words—a kind of benediction of friendship.—2. The promise given here with regard to the Paraclete is, that He will teach them 'all things and bring to their remembrance all things which Christ had spoken to them. How far this latter phrase may indicate an exact verbal recalling of Christ's words and teachings may be open to

question ; but there can be no doubt that a special influence of the Spirit upon the memory is promised, which should guard the apostles against error in their calling to mind and setting forth to others the doctrine which Jesus had taught them.—3. The words of ver. 27 are the parting salutation, evidently founded upon the common “Peace be with you” of the hour of separation. Meyer quotes from Luther the comment : “These are last words, as of one who is about to go away, and says good-night, or gives his blessing.” We cannot doubt, in view of this closing passage of the chapter, that the position which Jesus takes is that of the friend who is leaving his intimate associates behind him in a foreign land and returning to his home.—4. Ver. 28 is also to be explained in connection with this idea ; and the thought of the Father as greater than Himself is probably introduced here as indicating the joy and blessedness which would come to Him when He should return to heaven. They should rejoice in the joy of the friend who was leaving them, instead of simply sorrowing over their own loss and bereavement.—5. The simplest and most natural explanation of ver. 30 is that the last clause, “he has nothing in me,” means there is nothing common to him and me—the sphere in which he moves is that of hostility ; he is the ruler of the world, which is at enmity with me and my truth—and hence there is no time now for further conversation in this sphere of intimate and loving friendship. But now is the time to go forth and, by meeting, that which is to come, to show to the world that Jesus loves the Father and obeys His command.—6. The construction of *ἐγείρασθε, ἄγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν*—whether it is to be taken as an independent sentence or as connected by *ἀλλά* with what precedes, so as to be the leading verb of this part of the contrast—is uncertain. To the writer of this note it seems probable that the latter construction is the one intended by the author, and that the *ἄγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν* is contrasted by *ἀλλά* with *λαλήσω*.—7. The question whether Jesus actually went out from the room with His disciples at this time is probably to be answered in the negative. This appears from the following considerations :—(a) that there is no distinct statement that they went out until xviii. 1 ; (b) that the other Gospels represent the going out which followed the Supper as being a departure for the Mount of Olives, etc., which corresponds with what John says at the beginning of ch. xviii. ; (c) that as He certainly did not leave the city before xviii. 1, it follows that if He left the room at the end of ch. xiv., the discourses of chs. xv. and xvi., and the prayer of ch. xvii., must have been uttered in the city streets—but this seems quite inconsistent with such utterances.

## XXXIX.

## CHAPTER XV.

Vv. 1-11. 1. The fifteenth and sixteenth chapters evidently belong together and form one continuous discourse. This discourse consists of four parts :—first, the relation of the disciples to Jesus (vv. 1-11) ; secondly, their relation to one another (vv. 12-17) ; thirdly, their relation to the

world (ver. 18-xvi. 4) ; fourthly, the coming and work of the Spirit (xvi. 5-24). The closing verses of ch. xvi. (25-33) are of the nature of a conclusion, though closely connected in thought, at the beginning, with the verses which precede.—2. The main thought of the first part is that of the abiding of the disciple in Jesus. To set this forth, the figure of the vine and the branches is introduced.—3. On the words of these verses a few suggestions may be made :—(a) The adjective ἀληθινή, here as elsewhere in this Gospel, has the meaning: *which answers to the true idea*.—(b) The cleansing of the fruitful branches is accomplished by the word which Christ has spoken. This word has already effected its result in the hearts of the eleven faithful disciples, and the final exhortation which Jesus gives to them is to continue in the union with Him which is already begun.—(c) The words *without me you can do nothing* (ver. 5) are to be interpreted in connection with the idea of fruit-bearing, which is the idea of the verse. The fruit-bearing power depends wholly on the abiding in the vine. In a similar way the words of ver. 6 are to be explained as belonging to the figure, and the spiritual application of them is not to be carried into the individual expressions, but connected with the entire expression as a whole.—(d) It will be observed that the reference to the answers to prayer in ver. 7 is to such answers as are connected with results in the spiritual life.—(e) The words *my love* (ver. 9), like *my peace* (xiv. 27) and *my joy* (ver. 11), are to be explained of love going forth from Jesus, and not love to Him. They were to continue in such a state that His love could abide with them as His friends.—(f) The end in view of the whole presentation of the relation of the disciples to Christ is declared, in ver. 11, to be that their joy may be made complete by having the joy which He Himself has, as abiding in the Father's love, dwelling in their souls.

## XL.

Vv. 12-17. 1. The statement of ver. 13 is, of course, to be interpreted in view of the subject which is occupying the thought of Jesus. The love of enemies is not under contemplation.—2. The proof which Jesus gives, that He regards them as friends (ver. 15), is that He has made known to them all things which He has heard from God. This is not to be understood as inconsistent with what is said in xvi. 12, but only as declaring that He had treated them with all openness and friendliness, concealing nothing for the purpose of concealment.—3. The word ἐξελεξάμην of ver. 16, from its connection with φίλους, seems to refer to the choice of the eleven as friends. In the relation of the thought to the bearing of fruit, the idea of the apostleship is no doubt before the mind, and not improbably the turn to this idea is to be found in the verb ἐθίκα.—4. The second *iva* clause of ver. 16 is to be understood, with Meyer, Weiss, Godet and others, as co-ordinate with the first. This co-ordination, and the placing of the second *iva* clause where it is, serve to show, once more, how completely the thought of answers to prayer is limited, in these chapters, to the matters of spiritual life and fruit-bearing.

## XLI.

Vv. 18—xvi. 4. 1. The word *γινώσκετε*, which Godet prefers to take as an indicative, is better taken as an imperative. Jesus is giving them comfort and strength in view of the hatred of the world, and bids them bear in mind the fact that they would only be meeting what He had met before. He then reminds them, as a second thought, that it was the fact that He had chosen them, and that thus they did not belong to the world, which was the reason of the hatred. The hatred would therefore be an evidence that they were really His followers. *Ἐξελεξάμην* evidently means here a choice, not to the apostleship, but to discipleship as contrasted with the world.—2. Meyer regards the conditional clauses of vv. 20 as abstract cases supposed, the minds of the apostles being left to decide which would be realized. Godet, on the other hand, thinks both suppositions are intended to represent real cases. The mass of the people will not receive their message, but some will. The fact that the entire context refers to the opposition of the world seems to make the view of Meyer the more correct one.—3. The statement that they would not have had sin, vv. 22, 24, is to be explained in connection with the accompanying statement: “But now they have no excuse for their sin.” It is sin with no possible ground of excuse for it of which Jesus is speaking.—4. We see in vv. 22, 24 the two evidences, which are presented throughout this Gospel, brought forward once more—the words and the works—and the parallelism and partial repetition in these two verses are to be accounted for as connected with the desire to set them forth.

5. In vv. 26, 27 Jesus makes a new reference to the Spirit, by way of encouragement and support in view of the opposition of the world. As this was His purpose, it was natural that He should set forth here the testimony which the Spirit should give, and which should help the disciples in their conflict with the world. In xiv. 16 Jesus says that He will ask the Father, and the Father will give the Spirit; here, He says that He will send the Spirit from the Father; in xvi. 7 He says that He will Himself send the Spirit. The same indication of close union between Himself and the Father is given here, which we find in many places in this Gospel. Godet presses the distinction of the prepositions *ἐκ* and *παρά*, and the difference in the tense of *πέμφω* and *ἐκπορεύεται*, as showing that in the latter verb there is a reference to an emanating (essentially and eternally) from the Father. That this may be the correct view may be allowed, but as the verb *ἐκπορεύεται* is itself used with the preposition *παρά*, and as it does not, in itself, necessarily mean come forth out of the being or nature of God, it must be regarded as doubtful whether this interpretation can be insisted upon.—6. The present tense in *μαρτυρεῖτε* is doubtless used because the testimony of the disciples had already begun. The allusion to the disciples is secondary to the allusion to the Spirit, but it calls to mind the fact that they were, and were to be, a power in the world for the truth.

## CHAPTER XVI.

Vv. 1-4. After the words of encouragement, the passage is closed with the sentence *ταῦτα λελάληκα κ.τ.λ.*, expressing the purpose of this part of the discourse, and a repetition, with somewhat more of definiteness, of the statement of the persecutions which they must expect from the world. In this more definite statement two points are made prominent—that they would be put out of the synagogue, and that they would be exposed to death by violence. The former refers probably to a temporary exclusion from the synagogue, with its consequence, exclusion from social intercourse, and thus to one of the first results of determined hostility ; the latter, to the extreme of all evil which could be inflicted by adversaries. Thus the *ἀλλά* of ver. 2 contrasts the greater with the less ; not only the one, but, what is even far more, the other.—In ver. 4—evidently in consequence of the repetition just alluded to—the *ταῦτα λελάληκα* is repeated ; and the clause beginning with *ἵνα* in ver. 4 corresponds with the similar clause in ver. 1. By remembering, when these things should come upon them in the future, that Jesus had already forewarned them, they would be secured from the danger indicated by the verb *σκορδαλισθητε*.—The difficulty which has been found in connection with the last part of ver. 4, by reason of the fact that in Matt. x. and elsewhere, Jesus had given forewarnings of persecution, etc., is most simply explained by observing the whole preceding passage. Jesus had not given them this full statement with relation to the time of their separation from Him, as He does here, and He did not need to do so, because He was still with them. But now the time of His departure had come, and the future might be full of dangers to their faith if they were not forewarned.

## XLII.

Vv. 5-15. 1. Vv. 5, 6 form a transition passage, having a connection both with ver. 4 and ver. 7, the new section finding its proper beginning with the latter verse. The thought of vv. 5, 6 is kindred to that of xiv. 28—instead of rejoicing in the thought of what was to come to Him, of the place to which He was going, they were filled with sorrow of heart in view of their own loss. This failure to think of His happiness is here indicated by the words, “And no one of you asks me, Whither art thou going ?” This statement is not inconsistent with the implied question on this subject in xiv. 5, for the words of Thomas there involve, at the most, only a request for information, while here Jesus is speaking of the interest of a friend in the joy which is to be bestowed upon one whom he deeply loves. The connection with ver. 4 is seen in the contrast of *νῦν* to *ἐξ ἀρχῆς* ; but instead of going on to say, as we might have expected from the preceding, “Now I am going away, and I give you the needed prediction of what is to come,” He turns to the condition of mind of the disciples, and makes their sorrow at His separation from them an introduction to a renewed promise respecting the Spirit. “It is expedient for you that I go away, because upon my going away the coming of the new Helper, who will lead you in all the truth and give you permanent joy, is dependent.”

2. The work of the Spirit is set forth in this passage both in its relation to the world and to the disciples. The relation to the former is given in vv. 8-11. It will be noticed that the work which the Spirit will do is described by the verb *ἐλέγξει*, and has reference to three points: *sin*, *righteousness* and *judgment*. The verb presents the Spirit apparently as engaged in an argument or controversy with the world, and as convincing the world of the truth of His view of the matters in question and of the error of its view. This convincing is also, perhaps, to be regarded as a convicting and putting to shame. The three nouns which are connected with the verb are without the article or any defining word. This fact seems to indicate clearly that they are to be taken in the most general sense. This is true of all of them alike. The *ὅτι* clauses in vv. 9, 10, 11 give the ground on which the convincing or conviction is founded, and by means of which it is effected. The Spirit takes hold of the facts suggested in these *ὅτι* clauses, and uses them as proofs of His view with regard to sin, righteousness and judgment. The true interpretation of these sentences seems, accordingly, to be this: He shall convince the world with respect to sin—the truth of His view of it—by laying hold of and pressing the fact that they do not believe on Christ. This unbelief in Christ is the central sin, and all sin is that state of the heart which leads a man to refuse, when Christ is offered, to believe on Him. The world does not hold this view of sin, but the Spirit, by His testimony and His reasoning, convinces it that this is the true view. So of righteousness; the Spirit, while laying hold upon and pressing the fact that Christ goes away to the Father, so that He is seen no more—that is, the great consummation of His work in the ascension to heaven—will convince the world of His idea of righteousness: that righteousness consists in the union of the heart with God, the entrance to which is through faith. The world's idea of righteousness is of something outward and perfunctory. His idea is of something inward: the conformity of the man in the inmost recesses of the soul to what he ought to be. And again of judgment; the Spirit convinces the world of the truth of His view with respect to this also. The word *judgment* here is to be taken as condemnatory judgment, because this is the judgment pronounced on the ruler of the world. The Spirit accomplishes His end here, as in the former cases, by laying hold upon and pressing the fact which is set forth in the *ὅτι* clause: namely, the fact that the ruler of the world is already condemned. He is condemned in the sense that Christ's finished work has condemned his spirit and secured the final condemnation of himself and also his exclusion from his kingdom. That the work of Christ does this the Spirit impresses upon the world, and, by doing so, He shows the world that there is a condemnatory judgment awaiting its spirit and itself.

3. The work of the Spirit for the disciples is now set forth again, in contrast with that which He does for the world. The work for the world is that of convincing or convicting. The Spirit testifies and reasons and persuades. But in His work for the disciples, He only passes beyond the limitations which were necessarily imposed upon Jesus in His communications with them, by reason of the fact that they were as yet at the beginning and

were comparatively unenlightened. He leads them in the whole sphere of the truth and announces to them the coming things. Godet says that xiv. 26 contains the formula of inspiration of our Gospels, ver. 13 that of the Epistles and the Apocalypse. Whether this distinction can be properly made, and the statement of Godet pressed to the strictness of its letter, may be questioned. The "coming things" may, not improbably, include more than what are ordinarily spoken of as eschatological.

4. In doing this work for the disciples the Spirit will glorify Christ, for the announcements which He makes, whether of the general truth or of the things to come, will all be of what appertains to Christ—His system of teaching and His kingdom. This will and must be so, because all things which the Father has, and from which communications can be made to men, belong to Christ. The reference is, of course, to those things which fall within the sphere in which the whole thought is moving. Ver. 14, says Alford, "is decisive against all additions and pretended revelations subsequent to and besides Christ, it being the work of the Spirit to testify to and declare the things of Christ, not anything new and beyond Him." Alford also declares that ver. 15 "contains the plainest proof by inference of the orthodox doctrine of the Holy Trinity."

## XLIII.

Vv. 16-24. 1. The connection of the *μικρόν* with what precedes and the similarity in the expression to that in xiv. 19 show that the two passages refer to the same thing. For the evidence that the reference is to the time of and after the coming of the Spirit, see Note XXXVII., 3, above. It has been claimed that as *θεωρεῖτε* of ver. 16 is used of the bodily sight, so *δύσεσθε* must have the same meaning. But the possibility of a change to a spiritual sense can hardly be denied, when we study the sayings of Jesus which are recorded in this Gospel; and whether such a change is made in this case is to be determined by the indications of the following context. These, as we have already seen, make the change evident.—2. The words *ὅτι ὑπάγω κ.τ.λ.*, which are found in the T. R. at the end of the 16th verse, are omitted by Tischendorf, 8th ed., Westcott and Hort, Meyer, Alford, Weiss, and others. The external evidence is very strong against the genuineness of the words. The explanation of their use in the 17th verse is less difficult, if they are read in ver. 16; but it is, no doubt, possible to account for them in ver. 17 as derived from ver. 10. In the latter case Weiss is right, as against Meyer, in supposing that the words are introduced by the disciples as making the difficulty of understanding the meaning still greater, rather than with the feeling that the explanation of the latter words might serve for the clearing up of the former.—3. The answer which Jesus gives to their question and difficulty begins in ver. 20. But He reaches the explanation in an indirect way, by calling to their minds, first, the sorrow which they would feel, and the triumphant joy of the world, in consequence of His removal by death. This sorrow, however, would be only of brief duration, for, secondly, in consequence of His seeing them again, they would

have a permanent joy. The coming joy, thirdly, would be connected with the fact that they would have intercourse with the Father through prayer in the name of Jesus, the answers to which would make their rejoicing complete. This third point in the answer shows the meaning of the *ὄψεσθε* and *ὄψομαι* :—it is that seeing which belongs to the period of prayer (*αἰτεῖν*) addressed to the Father in the name of Jesus, and not of questions (*ἑρωτᾶν*) addressed to Jesus Himself—that is to say, the period when Jesus was not physically, but spiritually present with the disciples.—4. Weiss claims that the emphatic *ἐμέ* shows that Jesus is speaking of a time when He is personally (physically) present with the disciples, because, when He was not thus present, there could be no thought of such questioning of Him. But the real force of this emphatic *ἐμέ* is this : that their permanent joy was to be connected with a new intercourse with the Divine Being, not that of questions presented to *Him*, but of prayers offered to *God the Father* in His name. The emphasis on *ἐμέ* is thus completely accounted for, while the general reference is to the time which was to follow the coming of the Spirit.—5. That *ἑρωτᾶν* must mean *ask* in the way of *question*, cannot be affirmed ; in ver. 26 it probably means *ask* in the way of *petition*. But the contrast of the 23d verse renders it almost certain that such is the meaning of the verb *ἑρωτήσετε* in this case. It is hardly possible that, when Jesus was present with them so that they could speak with Him, they should not have asked Him questions.

## XLIV.

Vv. 25–33. 1. That the time referred to in ver. 25 ff. is the same with that described in vv. 20–24 is indicated by the fact that the same great characteristic of the period mentioned is here set forth as in the previous verses :—the communication with the Father in the name of Christ. It is also indicated by the fact that after the *ταῦτα λέλάληκα* of ver. 25 there is no distinct suggestion of a new subject, such as we find in xv. 12, 18.—2. The force of the words *καὶ οὐ λέγω κ.τ.λ.* of ver. 26 is undoubtedly this : that the presentation of a request from Himself would not be necessary, because the Father would have an independent personal love for them on the ground of their acceptance of Him and love towards Him. The words “I do not say,” instead of an expression such as “I deny that I will, or say that I will not,” as well as the very nature of the relation between Jesus and the disciples—we may add, the indications elsewhere given of Jesus as an intercessor—show that He does not mean to deny that He will thus ask the Father for them. He did not need, indeed, to assure them of this, for they could not doubt that it would be so. But the one thought here is, that they might have confidence, when approaching the Father in prayer, that He had a personal love for them, and, by reason of this, would be ready to answer their petitions—and this would be a vital element in their future permanent joy.—3. The words of the disciples in vv. 29, 30, which have a special reference to ver. 28, in its connection with what precedes, are a new declaration and measure of their belief. Coming, as this declaration does, at the close of the discourses and conversations of Jesus in chs. xiii.–xvi.,

it must be regarded as their profession of faith in view of this latest and most remarkable *σημείον*, in the sphere, not of works, but of words ; and, by its position and its contents taken together, it shows an increase in their belief beyond any former utterance.—4. In vv. 31, 32 Jesus acknowledges their faith (*ἀρτι πιστεύετε* is an affirmation, not a question), and, at the same time, reminds them that it is not yet perfected. It will show its remaining weakness as the approaching evils and dangers come. Therefore He has spoken to them all the words of this discourse (the *ταῦτα λεγόμενα* of ver. 33 points back to the whole of chs. xv., xvi.), that they may have peace and good courage in the midst of tribulation, being assured that He has overcome the world.

## XLV.

## CHAPTER XVII.

Vv. 1-5. 1. The prayer of Jesus has three parts : the first, a prayer for Himself, vv. 1-5 ; the second, a prayer for His disciples, vv. 9-19 ; and the third, a prayer for all subsequent believers, vv. 20-24. Vv. 6-8 form a transition passage between the first petition and the second, and vv. 25, 26 are a kind of conclusion.—2. The petition for Himself is that He may be glorified. The meaning of *δόξασον* in ver. 1 is to be understood of that glory which is connected with the return of Jesus to His Father, and which is more particularly set forth in ver. 5. It was by means of this glorification that He would be enabled, in connection with the sending of the Spirit and the greater power which would be exerted for the advancement of His kingdom upon the earth, to accomplish the purpose indicated in the *ἐνα* clause—the glorification of the Father upon the earth, in accordance with the measure of the Divine gift of power over all flesh which was bestowed upon Him. To realize the fulfilment of all that was involved in this gift, so that eternal life should be given absolutely to all whom the Father had given to Him, it was necessary that He should pass away from the limitations of His earthly condition to the heavenly state. The hour for this departure from earth to heaven having now come, He prays for the realization of the heavenly glory.—3. In vv. 4, 5 this glory is spoken of as that which Jesus had with the Father before the existence of the world. He prays to be restored to His former glory. The end in view is that mentioned above ; but what the glory referred to is, is now more definitely stated. The ground, also, is presented on which it is asked for : because, through the accomplishment of His work, Jesus has already glorified the Father on earth. He has finished the task assigned Him, and now, when the appointed hour arrives, He asks for the reward.—4. Ver. 3 gives a definition or explanation of the meaning of eternal life. This life is the knowledge of God and Jesus on the part of the soul of man—which is, in one aspect of it, the idea that is everywhere set forth in this Gospel as belonging to these words. There can be no doubt that John views eternal life as a peculiar kind of life—it is the life which consists in the knowledge of God, the light-life, the life which resembles God's own life, and which is entered

by faith. But the adjective *eternal* does not seem to be applied to it for the reason that it is the light-life, etc., but because, when it is once possessed by the soul, it never ends.—The definition is introduced here in connection with the words of the preceding verses. To give eternal life, it is necessary to give the knowledge of God and of Christ. To give this knowledge to the “all” spoken of in ver. 2, without exception and in its fulness, it is necessary that Jesus should be glorified.—5. The fifth verse distinctly declares the pre-existent state of Christ and His glory in union with the Father in that state. No other legitimate interpretation and explanation of the words can be given.—6. The prayer of Jesus for Himself is evidently not made for the purpose of securing simply a reward or blessedness for Himself, but with a view to the glorifying of God in the accomplishment of the great mission which had been assigned to Him. The work of the Messianic kingdom was not yet completed. It was only the work of His earthly life that was done; and He prays for what is beyond this life, to the end that the glory of the Father, which has already been partially secured, may be completely secured—that is, that the kingdom may be fully established.

#### XLVI.

Vv. 6–19. 1. Vv. 6–8 are connected both with the preceding and with the following context. In relation to the preceding verses, they indicate, by the presentation of the case of those in whom the work had been accomplished in the highest degree, and through whom, as the human instruments, it was to be carried forward in the time to come, the proof of what is stated in ver. 4. On the other hand, these verses evidently prepare the way for the petition of ver. 9, giving a reason why these persons, and not the world, are commended to the care of the Father. In these verses there is, in reality, a summing up of what has been presented in the entire record of this Gospel as connected with the reception of the Divine life :—*(a)* The persons in question are those who have the susceptibility to the truth, *Thine they were and Thou gavest them to me*; *(b)* Jesus has made known to them the Father’s name—the name, here as elsewhere, standing as the representative of all that is involved in the revelation of God through Christ; *(c)* This revelation comes through the word which Jesus has spoken to them; and they have kept it in their heart and life; *(d)* In receiving and keeping the word, they have recognized fully the great truth which it involved—namely, that the origin of Christ’s teachings and mission is from the Father. The work which had been given Him to do is thus fulfilled in their case.

2. Vv. 9–13. The prayer is for the disciples, and not for the world. The explanation of the exclusion of the world here is, not that those who belong to the world are excluded from the prayers of Christ, but that this prayer is, like the discourses of the preceding chapters, a prayer of the departing one who is leaving his friends behind him. At such an hour, the prayer for enemies does not have its proper place. The petition is for the friends only, with reference to the state of separation from Jesus which was

just before them.—3. The particle *ὅτι* of ver. 9 is to be connected with *σοὶ εἰσὶν* and *δεδοξασμαι*, the words from the first *καί* to the second *ἐμὰ* of ver. 10 being parenthetical in their character. The ground of the prayer which is here presented is thus, in substance, what has been already mentioned—that they belong to the Father, and that Jesus has been glorified in them. In ver. 11 the additional reason, relating to the future, is given—that they were to remain in the world bereft of His care.—4. The petition for the disciples is set forth in two forms : first, in the more general way in ver. 11, *keep them in thy name*, and, secondly, more particularly in vv. 15, 17—in ver. 15 on the negative side, *keep them from the evil*, and in ver. 17 on the positive side, *sanctify them in the truth*.—5. The explanation of ver. 13 given by Meyer seems to be the correct one : “ *But now I come to thee*, and since I can no longer guard them personally as hitherto, *I speak this* (this prayer for thy protection, ver. 11) *in the world* (‘ *jam ante discessum meum*,’ Bengel), *that they*, as witnesses and objects of this my intercession, knowing themselves assured of thy protection, *may bear my joy* (as in xv. 11, not xiv. 27) *fulfilled in themselves*.”

6. Vv. 14–19. Ver. 14 is to be regarded as introductory to ver. 15, as ver. 16 is to ver. 17. In both cases, the fact that the disciples are not of the world, as Jesus Himself is not of the world—and thus (ver. 14) that they are objects of the hatred and enmity of the world—is made the ground of the special petition. The turn of thought, therefore, from the more general to the more particular request is made, not at ver. 15, but at ver. 14.—7. The words *τοῦ πονηροῦ* of ver. 15 may be neuter, or they may be masculine. This is the only instance in which the expression is found in this Gospel, but in the First Epistle of John there are five cases which may be compared with the one in this verse. In 1 John ii. 13, 14 the masculine form is beyond doubt, *you have overcome the evil one*, *τὸν πονηρόν*. In 1 John iii. 12—Cain was *ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ*—the connection of the verse with those which precede, in which the devil is spoken of, makes it substantially certain that the words are masculine and refer to the evil one. In 1 John v. 18 the reference to the evil one is certain, for the words are *ὁ πονηρός*, and in 1 John v. 19, where the dative *ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ* is used, the contrast of the two closely united sentences is such as to give an overwhelming probability in favor of the same reference. So far, therefore, as the usage of the writer can be determined from these passages, the argument derived from it is altogether in favor of the same explanation of the phrase in the verse before us. The same explanation is favored by the fact that John's Gospel seems distinctly to present the idea of two spheres or kingdoms, each presided over by a ruler. The use of *τηρεῖν ἐκ* in Rev. iii. 10 may be regarded as justifying the use here, if *τ. πον.* is taken as masculine.—Godet, who holds that this genitive with *ἀπό* and *ῥύεσθαι* in Matt. vi. 13 refers to the evil one, thinks that the preposition *ἐκ* is more naturally referred to a domain, from which one is taken, than to a personal enemy. Of the most recent commentators on this Gospel, Weiss, Keil, Westcott, Milligan and Moulton, like R. V., regard the words as masculine.—8. Ver. 17 gives the positive form of the request : *Sanctify them in the truth*. The word *ἀγιασόν*

refers, as we may believe because of its connection with the idea of *τηρήσεις κ.τ.λ.*, and also with the words of ver. 18, to that consecration of the disciples with reference to their future work, which would be accomplished for them by their being made holy in the sphere of the Divine truth. "The prayer," says Westcott, "is that the consecration which is represented by admission into the Christian society may be completely realized in fact; that every faculty, offered once for all, may in due course be effectually rendered to God (Rom. xii. 1)."—9. The last sentence of ver. 17, *Thy word is truth*, is best understood, with Godet, DeWette and others, as denoting the means by which the sanctifying process is to be accomplished, or rather (since the *ἐν* of the first part of the verse is not the instrumental preposition, as Godet takes it, but means *in the sphere of*) as giving a more definite statement of what is referred to in the words *the truth*. Thy word is truth, hence when I pray for these disciples, says Jesus, I pray for their consecration in the sphere of the truth.—10. Ver. 18 gives the special reason for making the prayer a prayer for their consecration—namely, that they have a mission like to His own, and ver. 19 adds the declaration that to this end He also consecrates Himself in offering Himself to death. This fact: that He thus devotes and consecrates Himself, is also, like the words of ver. 18, a reason for urging His petition (ver. 17).

#### XLVII.

Vv. 20–26. 1. Vv. 20–24. The prayer now turns to the great company of believers in all coming time. These will become believers through the word, spoken or written, of the apostles. The prayer for them is, that they may be one. This was presented in ver. 11 with reference to the apostles themselves, as the end for which Jesus asked that the Father would keep them. The unity here referred to is set forth more fully in the following words and verses. It is evidently such a unity as would, by its natural influence, lead the world to believe in the divine mission of Christ (ver. 21); it was one which was in correspondence, in some sense, with that which exists between the Father and the Son (vv. 20b, 22); it was one which was founded upon an indwelling of Christ in them, answering, in some sense, to the indwelling of the Father in Christ (ver. 23a); it was a perfected unity, which should, by its very existence, prove that the Father loved them after a similar manner to that in which He loved Christ (ver. 23b). These points, taken together, show that the unity is something more than the unity of love mentioned in xiii. 34, 35. In addition to the principle of love to one another which makes the company of believers one, there is here a common life-principle which they gain from the revelation and teaching, and also from the spirit of Christ. The spirit of Christ dwells in them and makes their spirits life (Rom. viii. 10). As Christ lives on account of and in the Father, so they live on account of and in Christ.—2. In ver. 24 there is a further request for these believers, which reaches out into their future life in heaven. There is no determination in this verse as to the time when this future union will begin, but, if xiv. 3 can be interpreted as in Note XXXV. 3, above, it will begin immediately

after the death of each believer ; and, whether this interpretation be given to that particular verse or not, a union with Christ from that time onward is indicated in other passages in the New Testament. The full blessedness of the believer, however, and the most perfect beholding of the glory of Christ, may perhaps not be enjoyed until after the Parousia. The perfection of unity in and among themselves on earth, and the union with Himself in a dwelling together in heaven, are the two gifts which Jesus asks for all His followers in all ages.—3. The glory spoken of in ver. 24 is apparently that which is referred to in vv. 1, 5—the glory which is bestowed upon Christ as the reward of His earthly work, and which involves a restoration to that glory which He had with the Father even before the creation of the world. It is spoken of as given to Him, because it is viewed as the reward of His work. As it is, however, the glory mentioned in ver. 5, there can be no reason for doubting that the words *thou didst love me before the foundation of the world* involve the idea of Christ's pre-existence, which is clearly set forth in ver. 5.

4. Vv. 25, 26. These verses form a kind of conclusion of the whole prayer, and the thought seems to turn back to Himself and the apostles, with a declaration that they stand apart from the world, and an appeal to the righteousness of God to grant the requests because of this fact. There is evidently a contrast in these verses, not merely between the world and the apostles, but between the world, on the one side, and Himself and the apostles on the other. Jesus, however, places Himself here, as elsewhere in the chapter, not in precisely the same position in which He places them. He has the knowledge of the Father in and of Himself ; they reach the possession of it through Him. The *καί* following *δικαίε* is quite difficult of explanation. It seems to the writer of this note that Meyer's view is probably correct—the words being uttered with a pause after *δικαίε*, and the suggested thought being : *Yes, Thou art righteous ;* (the *καί* thus meaning *and yet ;*) and yet the world has not known Thee, but I have known thee, and these who are here with me on this last evening of my life have known Thee. Decide between the two parties according to Thy righteousness, and grant the petitions which I have offered. The objection which Meyer and Weiss make to the view of those who, with Bengel and Ebrard, regard the two *καί* as equivalent to the Latin *et . . . et*, seems decisive—namely, that it is inconsistent with “the antithetic character of the conceptions and with the manifest reference of the second *καί* to *ἐγὼ δέ.*”

## XLVIII.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

Vv. 1-11. 1. The word *ἐξῆλθεν*, for the reasons suggested in Note XXXVIII. 7, above, is to be understood as referring to the departure from the room. There can be no doubt that the place here indicated is the garden of Gethsemane, and thus that this Gospel represents Jesus and the apostles as going after the supper to this spot, which belonged probably to one of the

friends of Jesus.—2. The *σπεῖρα* or detachment from the Roman cohort was called upon to accompany the officers of the Sanhedrim for the purpose, apparently, of intimidation, and of assistance in case of any attempt at rescue. They were thus a secondary and attendant body, and, after ver. 13, where Jesus was led to the house of Annas, they disappear. When Jesus was thus securely in the possession of the Jewish authorities, these Roman soldiers had accomplished their work, and they then returned, doubtless, to the place where they were stationed by the civil government. The body which went forth for the arrest took the lanterns and torches, as well as their arms, for the purpose of impression. The fact that the full moon was shining would make no difference in such a case.

3. Godet, Meyer and others think that *ἐξῆλθεν* of ver. 4 means that Jesus went out of the garden. This may be the meaning, but it cannot be regarded as certainly so. Weiss holds, and this is not improbably the right view, that He came forth from the depth of the garden, or, with perhaps less probability, from the circle of the disciples. Westcott thinks that the *ἐξῆλθεν* is opposed to the *εἰσῆλθεν* of ver. 1; this, however, is questionable.

—4. There is a certain difficulty in bringing John's narrative in ver. 5 f. into accordance with Matt. xxvi. 49 f., but it may probably be due to the brevity of the narrative in the latter case, or even in both cases. The approach of Judas to Jesus with a kiss and the words of Jesus in answer must be placed before the allusion to Judas in ver. 5 of this chapter.—5. The "falling to the ground" which is mentioned in ver. 6 can scarcely be explained, except by some special influence exerted by Jesus' supernatural power. Roman soldiers would hardly have been thus prostrated by the mere dignified or innocent bearing of an ordinary man, or by the unexpected calmness of Jesus' demeanor.—6. The words of the 9th verse, when connected with those to which they refer in xvii. 12, must include more than the idea of a loss occasioned by arrest or death. The result of the arrest of the disciples, or any of them, He feared might be a danger to their faith and thus to their salvation, and so His mind turns again here to what had been His thought in the latter part of ch. xv. and elsewhere.—7. The last words of ver. 11 present a similar thought to that of the prayer in Gethsemane as recorded in the other Gospels. It seems not unnatural that the mind of Jesus should have been full of this thought on this last night.

#### XLIX.

Vv. 12–27. There are in this passage two great questions, one having reference to the examination of Jesus, and the other bearing upon Peter's denials. On these two questions the following brief suggestions may be offered:

I. The examination of Jesus. That this was not the one an account of which is given by the Synoptic Gospels is rendered probable by the following considerations:—(a) The fact that it was in the house of Annas. Ver. 24 cannot be satisfactorily explained except as indicating that Jesus was not sent to Caiaphas until after the examination here recorded. (b) The character

of the examination itself. It was not of a judicial character. Jesus was simply inquired of as to His disciples and His teaching, as if in a conversation or an informal inquiry. In the Synoptic account, on the other hand, witnesses are called, and the whole proceeding is like that of a court, with the high-priest presiding as a judge. (c) If the two accounts are carefully compared, we find, in connection with what has been said under (b), that all the details are different in the two: the questions addressed to Jesus; His answers; the minor circumstances, and the persons participating in the scene. This is certainly the fact, with the possible exception that the high-priest who takes part in the two scenes was the same person, and that the blows inflicted upon Jesus by bystanders were given by the same persons. The latter supposition is neither necessary nor probable, for the language used by those who smote Him is not the same, nor to the same effect. As to the former supposition, see below. (d) It is altogether improbable that if John was present at the judicial trial recorded in the Synoptics, he would have given an account of only a part of it, and would have omitted the most important part—namely, that which contained the final result and decision. On the other hand, if what John relates was a more informal and private inquiry in the house of Annas, which preceded the judicial examination, it is very easy to believe that John was not admitted to the latter, and that he gives the account of what he heard, and passes over what he did not hear.

The question as to whether the high-priest mentioned in vv. 15–23 is Annas or Caiaphas is one of some difficulty. It is evident that Caiaphas is spoken of in this chapter, and elsewhere in this Gospel, as the high-priest, and that Annas is not thus spoken of, unless in these verses. It is also evident that Caiaphas was the actual high-priest at the time, and that Annas was not. Moreover, the allusion to the high-priest in ver. 15, following immediately as it does upon ver. 13, where Caiaphas is declared to be the high-priest, is such that, in the case of ordinary words, there would be no doubt that the reference in the two verses was the same. It is to be observed, however, on the other hand, that ver. 24, when compared with ver. 13, seems to separate Annas and Caiaphas altogether, and to limit what is said between ver. 15 and ver. 24 to the house and presence of Annas. Godet, as also Riggenschach, Ebrard, Hofmann, and others, suppose that the two lived in the same palace. The only improbability in such a supposition is, that they were dignitaries of such high position; but this is removed, provided we regard them as occupying two palatial residences which were on opposite sides of a common interior court, and were thus, in reality, one great building surrounding the court. There would seem to be an improbability, however, that the actual high-priest himself, who was to preside at the trial, would have entered into such a conversation and inquiry just before the trial began. His judicial position and dignity might seem inconsistent with it. But that Annas should do so might well have been in the plan of the leaders. It might well be a part of the attempt to prepare for the trial by involving Jesus, if possible, in some difficulty or self-accusation. As Annas, therefore, is called high-priest by Luke, both in his Gospel and in the Acts, and as he had held the office and was unquestionably in a very

exalted position in the public opinion, it is more probable that the title is given to him in the verses under consideration, and that he was the person who conducted this inquiry.

## L.

II. The denials of Peter. Vv. 15-27.—In respect to these there are two points of inquiry :

1. As to the place where they occurred. That the first denial occurred in the court of the house of Annas is certain, if Jesus was not sent to the house of Caiaphas until ver. 24. But, if this was the fact respecting the first denial, the connection of ver. 25 with ver. 18 furnishes the strongest proof that the second and third denials also occurred in the same court. The opening words of ver. 25 evidently resume the closing ones of ver. 18, and the absence of any expressed subject for the verb *εἶπον* of ver. 25 can only be explained in a natural way by supposing that the subject is intended by the author to be the same persons as those who are mentioned in the 18th verse. We may believe, therefore, that all the denials took place in one and the same court ; that this was the court of the house of Annas ; and that the last of the three denials coincided in point of time with the moment when Jesus went forth from the house of Annas on His way to that of Caiaphas. If we now suppose that the house of Caiaphas stood on the opposite side of the same court, so that the latter belonged equally to the two houses, the accounts of all the Gospels, so far forth as the place of Peter's denials is concerned, can be easily brought into harmony.

2. As to what was said by Peter, and as to those who addressed him.—That there were three denials, and three only, must be admitted as proved, beyond reasonable doubt, by the fact that Jesus predicted only three, and that each of the Gospels speaks of three only as having occurred. The attempt to escape the difficulties of the case by the supposition of two or three sets of denials, each consisting of two or more, is one which is contradictory to the impression produced by every one of the evangelists.—The most serious difficulties in the reconciling of the different narratives are, *first*: with respect to the persons, the fact that in the case of the second denial Mark represents the same person as speaking to Peter who had spoken to him in the first case, while the other Gospels represent that it was another person—another maid (Matthew), *ἑτερος* (Luke), the servants and officers (John). If the maid was actually another (and not, as Mark intimates, the same), and if she moved the servants, etc., to unite with her, the other three writers may be harmonized ;—*secondly*: with respect to what was said to Peter, the fact that John states that the kinsman of Malchus, in the case of the third denial, said, *Did I not see thee in the garden with him*, while the other evangelists represent that the words (spoken, according to Matthew and Mark, by those who stood by, and, according to Luke, by another) were, *Surely thou art one of them, for thou art a Galilean, and thy speech agreeth thereto*, or words substantially like these. This may be easily explained, if we suppose that immediately upon the latter words, which came from several of the bystanders, this kinsman of Malchus pressed the matter home upon Peter

by saying, *Did I not see thee*, etc.;—*thirdly*: with respect to the interval between the denials, the fact that Luke represents that there was about an hour between the second and third, while, if we are to suppose any interval of this sort as indicated by John, it is apparently between the first and second. The differences in regard to what Peter said are scarcely worthy of notice. There would seem to be no need, therefore, of supposing any such multiplying of the number of denials as has been imagined by some writers. With regard to the time previous to which the three denials were, according to the prediction of Christ, to take place, it is the same undoubtedly in all the Gospels, for Mark means by the words *before the cock crows twice* precisely what the other writers mean by *before the cock crows*—namely, the end of the watch called ἀλεκτροφοβία.

## LI.

Vv. 28-40. The bearing of ver. 28 on the question as to whether Jesus died on the 14th or the 15th of the month Nisan, and, in connection with this, whether the Lord's Supper was instituted on the evening of the Jewish Passover supper, is dependent on whether the expression to *eat the Passover* can be, or probably is to be, referred to anything else than the Passover supper itself. The presentation of the facts of the case by Godet is sufficient to show two things: first, that the passages from the Old Testament which are relied on to prove the wider extension of meaning for the expression in question do not prove it. Indeed, the point to be proved is not simply an extension of meaning to cover the whole feast, but such an extension as would cover the rest of the feast, with the exclusion of the supper itself;—secondly, that there is no sufficient reason to believe that the words *that they might not be defiled* are not applicable to the 14th day.—It is doubtful whether it can be affirmed as beyond question that the words here used *must mean* that the Jewish Passover supper had not yet occurred. But this is nevertheless the more natural interpretation of the words, and the probabilities of the case point strongly in this direction.

2. If we may take John's account as giving the beginning of the trial of Jesus before Pilate, it would seem that the Jewish rulers supposed that the mere fact of their presenting Him before the Roman tribunal would secure a verdict in their favor. They must have supposed that this result would be secured either by the respect which Pilate, in such a case, would have for them as rulers among the Jews, or by the fact that the crime of blasphemy was one which might properly come under their jurisdiction, and that the resort to the Roman power was only to obtain permission to inflict the death-penalty which the crime deserved. Their first words to Pilate (ver. 30) in answer to his question of ver. 29 imply, apparently, that whatever charge they have against Jesus belongs within the sphere of their own law, rather than that of the Romans.

3. The simplest explanation of the question proposed by Pilate in ver. 33 is that the Jews, after ver. 31, brought forward the charge which is mentioned in Luke xxiii. 2: "We found this man perverting our nation, and

forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, and saying that he himself is Christ, a King." This view of the matter is taken by Godet and others. Meyer denies this, and holds that John could not have omitted such an essential point. He thinks that Pilate must have known of this political accusation through the application of the Jews for the help of the *σπειρα*. Weiss, however, in his edition of Meyer's Commentary, declares these reasons of Meyer to be insufficient. The omission of the charge as something already known, and something that would be understood, is in consistency with what we find in John's Gospel in other cases. It is certainly difficult to account for Pilate's question unless there was some such charge, and the insertion of Luke xxiii. 2 here is not unnatural.

4. The explanation given by Godet in ver. 34 is also, in all probability, the true one. If we hold that Jesus intended to ask whether Pilate meant that He claimed to be a king in the Roman and political sense, or in the Jewish and Messianic sense, the course of the conversation and inquiry moves on in the most simple and natural way. If He claimed to be king in the former sense, there might be just ground of accusation against Him before the Roman tribunal, but if in the latter, there might be none. Pilate answers, "Am I a Jew?"—that is to say, I have nothing to do with Jewish questions. I mean, of course, king in the only sense of the word in which I, as a Roman judge, can consider it. This is a matter belonging wholly to the Jews: they have delivered thee to me, with a charge that thou claimest to be a king in opposition to Cæsar. I have to investigate this question only. Tell me what thou hast done.—Having drawn an answer to this effect from him, Jesus now, in His turn, gives a more definite reply—that He is a king, but not in the Roman sense—and He adds the most decisive proof of this negative: namely, that if He were a king or claimed to be one in the earthly meaning of the word, His servants would fight for Him, as they were evidently now not doing. Pilate then asks if He really means that He is a king, and Jesus answers: Yes—in the sphere of the truth. Truth is nothing to Pilate, and he goes out at once, and says, I find no crime in Him, and proposes to release Him. Nothing can be more simple and straightforward than this progress of thought, if the explanations of vv. 33 and 34 which have been suggested are adopted as correct.—5. The servants spoken of in ver. 6 are those who believe in the justice of His claims. They are, in one sense, His disciples, but the case is presented as a hypothetical one, and these adherents are accordingly conceived of as they would be if the circumstances were in accordance with the supposition.—6. The *ουκουν* of ver. 37 should have the circumflex accent on the last syllable, and the meaning is thus, "After all, then, thou art a king?" "Is it not true, then, that thou art a king?" The question is, so far as the progress of thought in the passage is concerned, merely a renewal of the one which had been suggested before. But it includes a certain ironical element, or an expression of surprise that one in the condition of Jesus should claim to be a king in any sense.—7. The phrase *Thou sayest* is, in substance, an affirmative answer. A. R. V. regards *ὄτι* as meaning *for*, and this is not improbably the true view of the sentence: Yes, for I am a king.

8. The question of Pilate, *What is truth?* undoubtedly indicates that he felt that there was no such thing, and that it was idle for a man to be dreaming of any such kingdom. Pilate's attitude towards Jesus was not that of enmity or of scorn. He was, apparently, impressed by His calmness, dignity and sincerity. He evidently believed Him guiltless, so far as any charge of crime against the Roman authority was concerned. He comprehended fully, we may believe, the bitterness and selfishness of the opposition of the Jews. He saw clearly that they had no foundation to rest upon, as they brought their case before him. He was disposed to discharge Him, and even tried to effect His release. But as related to "the truth," he was an intellectual sceptic. He believed that there was no such thing as truth. He had pity for Jesus, and regarded Him as a harmless enthusiast for what He called the truth; but he meant to remind Him by his question, that it was a delusion for Him to give Himself to the search for it, or to suppose that He had discovered it. It was for this reason, as we may believe, that he did not wait for an answer to his question. It was presented with no desire for an answer.—9. Pilate had the Roman sense of justice, as Renan says in the sentence quoted by Godet, and hence, when he went out to the Jewish rulers (ver. 38), he distinctly declared that he discovered no criminality in Jesus, and therefore proposed to release Him. But Pilate was a time-serving politician, rather than a man of lofty character and boldness in obeying his sense of right. He had, also, a dangerous record behind him. He was like men of his class, when placed in his circumstances, in all ages of the world's history. It was certain, from the beginning, that he would yield to the Jews. The question was only whether his resistance would be longer or shorter. The Jewish rulers were far bolder men, and they knew well with whom they had to deal. They pressed him gradually but steadily, and were ready with a new charge whenever the one already presented failed of its effect. The story of the two parties in this judicial attempt to put Jesus to death is so life-like, that it bears the strongest evidence of its truthfulness.—10. This life-like character of the narrative makes it probable that the author was an ear and eye-witness of what he relates, and, as Weiss ed. Mey. remarks, this seems not impossible when the publicity of the Roman judicial trials is borne in mind. That John should have had admission to the examination before Annas, by reason of his acquaintance with him, and to the trial before Pilate, because of the custom of admitting persons in such cases to the judgment-hall, but should have been excluded from the trial in the house of Caiaphas before the Sanhedrim, may easily be supposed—and the supposition is in harmony with the facts of the narrative as we find them: namely, the insertion of the story of what took place before Annas and Pilate, and the omission of the scene in the house of Caiaphas.

## LII.

## CHAPTER XIX.

Vv. 1-16. 1. The action of Pilate in connection with the scourging of Jesus and the giving Him up to the insults of the soldiers was evidently, as we see from vv. 4-6, with the design of inducing the Jewish leaders to yield with respect to the demand for His death. The words of ver. 4, "Behold, I bring him out to you, that you may know that I find no crime in Him," indicate anew his belief in Jesus' innocence and appeal to the sense of justice in the Jews. Those of ver. 5, "Behold the man," appeal to their compassion. If there be anything more than this appeal, it is probably what Meyer supposes, "This suffering one cannot be the usurper of a throne." It suggests, therefore, the unreasonableness of their course, the groundlessness of their severity. Finally, the words of ver. 6 are spoken with indignation, as Pilate finds that his effort is unsuccessful and that their answer to his appeal is only in the outcry, "Crucify, crucify." At this point Pilate approaches to the very borders of the boldness of real courage. It was the point which men of his character sometimes reach under great provocation, and where only a step is needed to transform them into men of true nobility or even heroes. But the step is not taken. To any one who has, in his own experience with men, seen a character of the order of Pilate subjected to a test of a similar kind—who has seen the struggle, the impulse to do the right act, the indignation at the unyielding opposition and pressure, the seemingly courageous refusal to violate the sense of justice in the soul, let the enemies do what they will, and then the submission, at the end, through fear inspired by the consciousness of a past career which it is dangerous to have investigated or made public—to any one who has seen this, the story of Pilate leading up to this point will prove that the author who tells it was either the witness of the facts, or that he had the creative imagination of the higher order of writers of fiction. But the author of this Gospel, whatever else he may have possessed, certainly did not have this creative imagination.

2. The Jewish rulers, finding Pilate dangerously near to a refusal of their demands, are driven to the use of the last two means at their command—the excitement of his fear of disregarding their law, which the Roman power, according to its policy towards conquered nations, would respect, and of his fear of the Roman emperor, in case he seemed to protect one who was guilty of treason. They try to awaken the former fear first. The resort to personal intimidation, in the strictest sense of the words, was so base a thing that they would reserve it for the final moment, the moment of absolute necessity.—In their appeal to their own law, we see once more that the charge against Jesus was blasphemy. They understood Him to place Himself on an equality with God.—3. The effect of what they said was evidently different from that which they expected. Pilate's fears were awakened, but in another line. The sceptic became superstitious. The movement of Pilate's mind here was most natural. The intellectual, as well as the careless, doubter, when he is aroused by some thought of the possi-

bility that the belief of those about him may, after all, be true, easily passes, for the moment, into the sphere of superstition, or what is like it. This must have been the case, in a peculiar degree perhaps, with men of this class in the age when Pilate lived. As he hears the expression, *Son of God*, and thinks of the wonderful bearing of Jesus and His remarkable words, he seems to question whether He may not be, indeed, something more than an ordinary man, some Divine messenger or being who has appeared on earth.—4. The reason why Jesus gave no answer to Pilate's question suggested by his fear : *Whence art thou ?* we may believe to have been His knowledge that Pilate's condition of mind and heart was such that an answer would have accomplished no good. The sceptic of Pilate's class, whether he is rejecting truth as having no reality, or, under the influence of some sudden fear, is turning towards superstition—whether he is ready to say, *What is truth ?* or, *Whence art thou ?*—is best treated as Jesus treated Pilate. He asks his question with no desire or intention to be moved in his inner life if the true answer is given—and silence is the only answer that may, by a possibility, awaken his conscience.

5. Pilate now assumes the dignity of his office, and calls the attention of Jesus to the power which he possesses over Him. To this Jesus replies. In the words of Jesus (ver. 11) there are apparently two suggestions : first, in the way of rebuke to Pilate, reminding him that all his power is dependent on God ; and, secondly, in the way of lenity, admitting that his sin is less than that of the Jewish rulers. The verse, in its details, bears especially on this latter point. Because the authority over Jesus in the present case was given to Pilate of God—that is, because he was in a Divinely assigned station, according to the providential arrangement, where he must judicially try all persons brought before his tribunal, his sin was less than that of those who, by their own voluntary action, brought Him before that tribunal. His act in conducting the trial was a part of his official work ; theirs was a wilful violation of all justice. There was an involuntary element in his relation to the matter, but not in theirs. This fact lessened his sin. Whatever Pilate's sin might be in his final yielding to the pressure of the Jews, it would not equal that voluntary, selfish, bitter enmity which originated the whole movement against Jesus, and carried it forward even to the point of bringing Him before the Roman governor and demanding His crucifixion.

6. The words of ver. 12—whether we understand them, with Godet and most commentators, as implying a succession of further efforts to persuade the Jews and release Jesus with their consent, or, with Weiss, as meaning that he attempted to release Him at once, but was prevented by the renewed outcry of the Jews—show that Pilate was much affected by the words of Jesus (ver. 11) and His silence (ver. 9). Pilate was not, indeed, moving towards belief in Jesus ; he was not in a condition of mind to receive honestly and heartily the answer which Jesus must have given, had He broken His silence in ver. 9. But he was conscious of the injustice of treating Him as a criminal, and apprehensive, perhaps, of the vengeance of the Divine power, or of some divinity represented in or by Jesus, if he

gave Him up to His enemies. He attempted anew, therefore, to release Him.

7. The Jews bring forward the appeal to Pilate's personal fears as related to the Roman emperor. These fears were, doubtless, due to two causes : first, the well-known suspiciousness of the emperor ; and, secondly, his own bad record in the past. The latter point was the one of greatest importance. Resistance became hopeless from this moment, for he could not face the possibility of a charge against him at Rome, which should involve, perhaps, the investigation of his past career. He succumbed to the enemy—notwithstanding his conviction of the innocence of Jesus and his insight into the baseness and deadly hatred of the Jews—because he was unable to meet the threatened danger to himself.

8. The words, *Behold your King* (ver. 14), may, perhaps, have been intended in part to convey a final appeal to the Jews to consent to His release, and in part to express his own bitter feeling by way of scorn. Or they may, perhaps, have been intended to intimate that he now brought Jesus out before them to pass the sentence upon him which they should demand. Behold your king—the one whom you charge with declaring Himself against Cæsar—what shall be done to Him ? They answer, *Crucify Him*. Pilate says, *Shall I crucify your King?* He means, thus, to make them assume the responsibility, and assume it on the ground on which they had made their last accusation (ver. 12). In this latter case, and not improbably this is the right view, Pilate's question in ver. 15 is, as it were, his washing his hands (comp. Weiss) ; and, we may add, the reply of the chief-priests, *We have no king but Cæsar*, is, in substance, their expression of readiness to take the responsibility : *His blood be upon us and upon our children*. This last act and word of Pilate, as given in Matthew's Gospel and John's, is as characteristic of the men of Pilate's class as are all the other words and acts of his which John records.

9. The phrase *Preparation of the Passover* (ver. 14) may possibly mean either Friday of the Passover week, or the hours or day of preparation for the Passover feast. That it, probably, has the latter meaning is indicated by the fact that, if the former idea had been in the mind of the author, it would have been unnecessary to add the words *τὸν πῶσχα*, for every reader would know that it was the Passover week. If we hold that the Friday on which Jesus was crucified was the day in the day-light hours of which the preparation for the Passover supper, occurring in the evening, was made, and thus could properly be called the Preparation of the Passover and, also, the Preparation of the Sabbath, we find the simplest explanation of the terms which are used in different places and which designate it in one way or another as the Preparation. In the brief space allowed for these Additional Notes it was evidently impossible to enter into a full discussion of the question as to the day of Jesus' death, whether the 14th or 15th. The writer of these notes has limited himself, therefore, to an indication of the probabilities, as they appear to his own mind, in the several verses of this Gospel which bear upon the question, and the suggestion of a very few points which have seemed worthy to be considered. There is no passage in John's

work which is absolutely decisive, but each of the several passages where a pointing in either direction can be discovered seems to point, to say the least, somewhat more strongly towards the 14th as the day, than the 15th. The Lord's Supper, if this be the true view, preceded by one day the Jewish Passover supper.

## LIII.

Vv. 17-30. 1. The title which was placed upon the cross was, according to Matthew, This is Jesus, the King of the Jews ; according to Mark, The King of the Jews ; according to Luke, This is the King of the Jews ; according to John, Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews. The resemblances and variations in these forms given by the four evangelists are indicative of the character of their writings, and suggestive as to the view which is to be held respecting the relation of the Divine guidance to the words of the writers. That all the evangelists knew the substantial fact in the case is beyond question.—2. The fact that Pilate caused the title to be written, and the words which passed between him and the Jews in vv. 21, 22, are details of the history recorded by John alone, in consistency with his more graphic account of the whole matter. The life-like manifestation of Pilate's character appears even at the end of the story, in the title which he wrote, and especially in the words, "What I have written, I have written." These words exhibit the sort of apparent boldness and decision which seems to men like him to be a true assertion of themselves and truly courageous, notwithstanding their yielding to the pressure of the hostile party in the only vital point.—3. The recording of the two scenes which follow is, not improbably, intended to bring before the reader the same contrast at the scene of the crucifixion which is presented elsewhere in this Gospel. The soldiers, as the representatives of those on whom no impression at all had been made by the words and works of Jesus, appear as acting with the harshness and brutality of coarse men who were dealing with a criminal, and appropriating what the law allowed them, without sympathy. The explanation of the *iva* clause in ver. 24 is the same with that which has been mentioned in other cases—namely, that the New Testament writers saw in Christ the meaning and end of the whole Old Testament, and, in view of this, carried the fulfilment of the latter into all its parts, wherever these corresponded with the experiences of Christ.—4. The reference to the fulfilment of the Old Testament passage indicates that, to the view of the evangelist, the action of these soldiers was, though unconsciously on their own part, a testimony to the Messiahship of Jesus. The story is thus brought within the plan of the Gospel in the matter of *proof* or (in the more extended sense of that word) of *σημεία*, as it is also introduced, as already remarked, in connection with the matter of *belief* and *unbelief*.—5. The question as to whether three or four women are mentioned in ver. 25 is one which cannot be decisively answered on either side. That there were four, however, is the more probable view. This view is favored by the following considerations :—(a) The fact that Jesus committed His mother to John, and that John's house became her home, is more easily explained if John's mother was the

sister of the mother of Jesus. (b) The mother of John was present at the crucifixion scene, according to Mark xv. 40 and Matt. xxvii. 56, with Mary Magdalene and Mary the wife of Alphæus (Klopas). As she was associated with these women in a part of the scene, it is altogether probable that she may have been with them, also, throughout the whole. If, however, she was present at the time alluded to in ver. 25, there seems to be no reason why John should omit all reference to her. It would be rather in accordance with his custom when speaking of himself and his family, so far as we can judge, to mention or allude to her presence, while omitting her name. This would be what he does here, provided she is the one designated as *the sister of Jesus' mother*. (c) If we hold that Salome was in this relation to Jesus' mother, the request which she makes in Matt. xx. 20 ff. is most satisfactorily explained. (d) The supposition that Salome was the sister of Jesus' mother relieves us of the difficulty of supposing that two sisters had the name Mary. The only objection to this view which has any special weight is the one derived from the entire absence elsewhere in the Gospels of any distinct allusion to the existence of such a relationship. This objection must be admitted to be somewhat serious, but it may be questioned whether it can, by any means, overbalance the arguments which have just been presented.—6. The committing of Mary to the care of John cannot be accounted for simply on the ground that he was her nephew, for she had children of her own, or children of her husband by a former marriage, living with her, and these children were soon to be believers. John's relationship as nephew makes such an act on Jesus' part more natural than it would be otherwise, but there must have been something more than this in the case. There must have been a rising above all earthly relationships (see Vol. I., p. 510). The story becomes in this way an evidence of the living experience of the writer, and it enters into his plan as one of the things which marked the progress of his inner life. He tells his readers this fact which belonged to his own friendship with Jesus, believing that it would bear witness of what Jesus was in His union with individual souls, and would thus tend to bring them to seek after the life in and with Him.—7. The words "in order that the Scripture might be accomplished" are to be taken, according to Meyer, in connection with the previous clause, "that all things are now finished," but Weiss ed. Mey. agrees with Godet in connecting them with λέγει, Δίψω. The latter view is probably, though not certainly, the correct one.—8. Meyer holds that the words of Luke xxiii. 46, "Father, into thy hands I commend my Spirit," belong to "the enlarging representations of tradition." But it can hardly be considered inconsistent with the probabilities of the case that Jesus should have accompanied the word "It is finished," recorded in John, with these additional words addressed to His Father.

## LIV.

Vv. 31-42. 1. If the Sabbath referred to in ver. 31 was the 15th of Nisan, we have a very simple and satisfactory explanation of the expression that it was "a great day." In that case it was a weekly Sabbath, as being

Saturday, and also the feast Sabbath. This verse, therefore, points towards the conclusion that the day of Jesus' death was the 14th. The supposition that this Sabbath was the day of the sheaf-offering is far less probable. If the Sabbath mentioned was the 15th, the readers in Ephesus and its neighborhood, for whom John wrote, might be able to understand from the narrative itself and from the indications that all took place in connection with the Passover, how this day should be a Sabbath of a special character and special solemnity. But such a familiarity with the Jewish arrangements as to make them readily understand that the day of the sheaf-offering was referred to could hardly be supposed by him, so that he could allude to it without any more definite designation.—2. The reference in the words *he that has seen it* (ver. 35) is to what is mentioned in vv. 33, 34, and not merely to ver. 34b. This is indicated by the fact that the two quotations from the Old Testament point to vv. 33, 34a. The statement of ver. 34b can scarcely be regarded, therefore, as the one of sole prominence in connection with this scene.—3. With reference to the 35th verse as pointing to the author of the Gospel, see, in addition to Godet's note, the remarks in Vol. I., pp. 502, 503. A further consideration may be presented here, as connected with vv. 36, 37. These verses are so related to ver. 35 that they seem clearly to show that the witness referred to was confirmed in his belief by means of this fulfilment of prophecy. The allusion to this point corresponds, on the one hand, with what the author says elsewhere respecting the disciple whom Jesus loved—that is, himself—and, on the other, there is an additional improbability (in the line of that which is mentioned in Vol. I.) that he would bring forward the conviction of a person wholly unknown to the readers, and also unnamed, that a certain prophecy was true, as a matter of emphasis and importance.—The proof that the witness here is the author is found in every indication of the passage :—(a) in the valuelessness of the testimony as coming from an unknown person ; (b) in the statement that his testimony is ἀληθινή (that which corresponds to the true idea of testimony) ; (c) in the emphatic assertion, “ he knows that he says what is true ;” (d) in the declaration that he bears the testimony to the end that you (the readers) may believe ; (e) in the matter of the quotation from the prophetic writings. How impossible that a witness, necessarily insignificant because utterly unknown to any one who read the book, should be thus introduced.—4. The action of Nicodemus, as recorded in ver. 39, is certainly indicative of love and devotion to Jesus. It is worthy of notice that the evangelist does not say of Nicodemus, as he does of Joseph of Arimathea, that he was “ a disciple, but secretly for fear of the Jews.” This fact, when brought into connection with the position which he is represented as taking in the meeting of the Sanhedrim in ch. vii., vv. 50, 51, is worthy of consideration in forming our estimate of the character of Nicodemus.

## LV.

## CHAPTER XX.

Vv. 1-18. 1. The other women who are represented in the Synoptics as going with Mary Magdalene to the sepulchre are not mentioned here, and the appearance to all the women which is spoken of by Matthew, xxviii. 9, 10, is omitted by John. The former difference between John and the others may be explained, with Weiss, on the ground that John introduces the story only with reference to the message which Mary alone carried to Peter and himself; or it may be explained by supposing, with Luthardt and others, that she hastened in going to the grave more rapidly than the others who had started with her, and thus arrived alone before them. The latter difference may, not improbably, be due to a mingling together in the narrative of Matthew of what happened to the other women (the appearance of the angel, etc.) with what happened to Mary alone (the appearance of Jesus); or there may have been an appearance to the other women on their return from the sepulchre, and after Mary had left them, which was altogether different from the appearance to Mary herself. The sameness of the words represented by Matthew as addressed by Jesus to the women (ver. 10), with those addressed to them by the angel (ver. 7), may point towards the former supposition as the correct one. In any case, there is no insuperable difficulty in reconciling the different Gospels here. The word *οἶδαμεν* (ver. 2), as Weiss holds, in opposition to Meyer, may fairly be taken as indicating that Mary had others with her at the tomb or as she went towards it.—2. The story of Peter and John, as also that of Mary, bears the evidence of its truthfulness, both in the striking character of its details, which would scarcely have been thought of by a later writer, and its accordance in some of these details with the peculiarities of the persons in question, as presented before us elsewhere.—3. The *belief* which “the disciple whom Jesus loved” is said to have had in consequence of what he saw in the tomb, is not to be understood as simply a belief in the fact that Jesus had risen from the dead, but—in accordance with the use of the verb throughout this Gospel—a belief in Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God. He attained a belief, at this time and in view of what he saw, which was beyond what he had had before, a belief which included an understanding that He must rise from the dead, and thus that He was, by a new manifestation, proved to be the Divine Logos.—4. The failure of Mary to recognize Jesus at first is to be explained in part, perhaps, by some peculiarity in dress, etc.; but, in part, by the fact that she did not think of His appearance before her alive, and in a bodily form, as a possibility. It is noticeable that Jesus was, in several instances, not immediately recognized by those to whom He appeared.—5. The best explanation of the difficult expression *μὴ μου ἄπρην*, with what follows it in ver. 17, is, in the view of the writer of this note, that which takes *ἄπρην* in the sense of *cling to*. Jesus bids her not to cling to Him as if He were now to be in a new communion with her and His other disciples, such as He had promised before His death, but to go and tell His disciples that this was to come afterwards,

through and after His ascension. This is substantially the view of Godet, and it meets the demands of the words which follow as they are connected with this expression.—6. The story of Mary Magdalene, as here given, bears, in its first part (vv. 1, 2), wholly towards the faith of the two disciples; in its second part, it is evidently designed to present a proof of the resurrection of Jesus as tending to show that He is the Son of God. Testimony and experience come together, once more, in this place, and the author moves steadily towards the end which he has in view (vv. 30, 31). The incidents are selected and related, not for their own sake, but with a view to the great purpose of the book. But there is a new stage in the development here, which is evidently beyond what is found in the earlier chapters. The chronological progress, the progress in the testimony and proof, and the progress in faith, are seen to be united throughout the book in a very remarkable way. This union, in itself, bears witness that the whole narrative came from the author's own life and experience.

## LVI.

Vv. 19–29. 1. The appearance of Jesus when the doors were shut (vv. 19, 26) is a point which we are unable to explain. The evangelist has not stated the facts of the case with sufficient definiteness to make any conclusion absolutely certain. That Jesus had a body after His resurrection, which could be touched, and which bore the marks of the nails; that He could eat and walk, and could speak with the same voice as before His death; that He was seen and known to be the same person whom the disciples had been familiar with in their past association with Him, is evident from all the Gospel narratives. That, on the other hand, He appeared and disappeared at will, as He had not done before His death; that He was not recognized with the same immediateness, apparently, as He had been; that He even passed some hours with the disciples who were going to Emmaus, without any recognition on their part, seems equally clear. The mystery of His ascension may also be borne in mind in its relation to this question.—In the consideration of the particular words found in these verses (19, 26), two points are worthy of notice:—first, that we have no indication in other passages of any such thing as passing through the wood of closed doors—a thing which, in itself, would seem to be in the highest degree improbable; and, secondly, that we find the fact somewhat prominently suggested that, during the forty days, Jesus made Himself visible or invisible at will. May not these points, when taken together, indicate that Jesus here did not enter, at the time mentioned, into the room where the disciples were, but simply appeared to their view within it; that He appeared now as He disappeared at the close of His meeting with the disciples from Emmaus?—2. In vv. 21–23 Jesus renews to the disciples their commission, or assures them again that they have it, and then bestows upon them the gift of the Holy Spirit. With respect to this gift it may be observed: (*a*) that it is, according to the natural interpretation of the words, an actual gift; (*b*) that the distinction made by some writers

between *πνεῦμα ἅγιον* and *τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον* can hardly be sustained, and the words must here designate the Holy Spirit in the same sense in which the latter phrase is used (comp. vii. 39, xvi. 13) ; (c) that the full gift of the Spirit seems to be placed in this Gospel, as in the Acts, after the glorification of Jesus. From these three considerations it follows that the gift here referred to was of the same nature, but not of the same measure, with that of the Day of Pentecost. It was, as Meyer remarks, an actual *ἄπαρχή* of the Holy Spirit.—3. The power of remitting and retaining sins which is spoken of in ver. 23 is not something bestowed as a mere official prerogative on the disciples, so that their mere word and will accomplish the end. Jesus Himself exercised forgiveness only on the conditions of faith and repentance, and in accordance with the will of the Father. The whole teaching of the New Testament shows that the apostles could, at the most, only pronounce the man who believed forgiven, and, as they did not possess omniscience, this pronouncing could not go beyond the point of declaring that the man was forgiven, provided he had the faith required. It was under the guidance and in accordance with the mind of the Spirit that they were to exercise this power, but not in any such sense that forgiveness depended on them or was to be determined by them alone.—4. The exclamation of Thomas, in ver. 28, is the final declaration of the faith of the apostles as given in this Gospel. Immediately after the record of it the writer closes his book. That this is a declaration of belief in the Divinity of Christ is proved by the words *εἶπεν αὐτῷ*, by which it is introduced—these words show that it is not a mere exclamation of surprise or astonishment ; by the fact that *ὁ κύριός μου* is most naturally used as referring to Jesus (see xiii. 13, xx. 13) ; by the connection of these words with vv. 30, 31 ; by the whole progress of faith and testimony in this Gospel, as leading up to the end. If it is such a declaration, the 29th verse shows that it was accepted by Jesus. At such a moment—indeed, at any moment, but especially at such a moment, when He was soon to send forth the apostles on their great mission in the world, in which they were to proclaim His message and even to expose themselves to the danger of death in His cause—He could not have allowed them to remain under a delusion and to believe Him to be Divine when He was not. He could not have pronounced a solemn benediction on all who believed what He knew to be untrue. These words of Thomas, therefore, together with those of Jesus which follow, become a fitting climax of the whole book, both with respect to the testimony of Jesus to Himself and the answering faith of His immediate disciples.

## LVII.

Vv. 30, 31. This passage is evidently the conclusion of the Gospel as it was originally written, and it sets forth the purpose which the author had in view. We may notice in connection with these verses the following points:—(a) The writer evidently shows that he prepares his book on a principle of selection (many others are not written, but these are written) ; (b) The selections which he makes are made with a view to the proving of some

truth or doctrine or fact (*σημεία*) ; (*e*) The proofs are those which were given in the presence of the disciples—they depend for their force, therefore, in a special sense, upon the experience and personal witness-bearing of these disciples ; (*d*) The disciples are those whose first meeting with Jesus is recorded in the first chapter, and their companions in the apostolic company and the personal friends of Jesus ; (*e*) The doctrine or truth or fact to be proved is that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God ; (*f*) This statement, when interpreted as it must be by the Prologue, from which the entire development of the proof begins, must mean that He is the Logos made flesh ; (*g*) The object in view in giving this proof and establishing this doctrine is that the readers may believe what the writer evidently believes ; (*h*) The final purpose is that, through thus believing, the readers may have life—that is, that eternal life of which the book speaks.

## LVIII.

## CHAPTER XXI.

Vv. 1-14. The appearance of Jesus which is here recorded as taking place in Galilee is so entirely different in all its details from that which is mentioned in Matt. xx. 16 f., so far as any details are there given, that it must be regarded as a different appearance. Whether it occurred before or after the one in Matthew, cannot be determined. Godet supposes that the appearance recorded in Matthew coincides with the one to which Paul alludes in 1 Cor. xv. 6, where Jesus manifested Himself to more than five hundred of the believers. From the order of Paul's list of the appearances, however, and the form of expression which he uses respecting the appearance to the Twelve and that to all the apostles, it is more probable that the appearance to the five hundred occurred in Jerusalem during the week which intervened between the Sunday on which Jesus rose and the following Sunday. In the account in Matthew no distinct mention is made of any but the eleven, and, though it is possible that others may have been present, it is hardly to be supposed that so many as five hundred could be passed over without any allusion.—2. The object of the author in the introduction of this story of Jesus' appearance to the disciples seems to have been, not the appearance itself as proving the resurrection, or as suggesting the lesson which the miracle may be supposed to have carried within it, but as preparing the way for the conversation with Peter respecting himself and John which follows. This was the occasion on which the conversation took place. That Jesus intended, however, to teach some lesson of dependence on His wisdom and guidance as related to the future work of the apostles, and as, in some sense, preparatory for what was to be said to Peter, is to be regarded as probable.—3. The word *τρίτου* (ver. 14) must be understood as referring to the third appearance before a company of the apostles, etc., which is recorded in this Gospel, and as having no further bearing.

## LIX.

Vv. 15-23. In the words addressed to Peter there are two parts : first, those which bear upon his re-instatement in office, as it may be called ; and, secondly, those which relate to his death.—1. The words which are found in vv. 15-17 introduce the matter of Peter's re-instatement by calling attention to his former protestations of love, with respect to which he had so signally failed and fallen. The readiness of Jesus to forgive and to restore is thus more tenderly manifested here than anywhere else in the Gospel narrative. The passage exhibits Jesus, in this regard, in His relation to His own friends. Following upon the words which restore Peter to his place and position in the great work and kingdom, Jesus utters a word of prophecy, in which He proclaims, as it were, to the two friends among the apostles who stood nearest to Him in His love, and who were to continue in life for many years, as James was not, the future which they must expect. The testimony of Jesus to Himself, in His relation of love to the individual disciple, is thus brought out in this appended chapter, which by reason of this characteristic, as well as its many forms of expression, manifests a truly Johannean type.—2. That the word *these* (τούτων) in ver. 15 refers to the other disciples, and thus carries the thought back to Peter's protestation in xiii. 37, "I will lay down my life for thee," and the similar protestation in Mark xiv. 29 (comp. Matt. xxvi. 33), "Although all shall be offended, yet will not I," is generally admitted now by the best writers, and there can be but little doubt that this is the correct view.—3. As to the distinction between the words ἀγαπᾶν and φιλεῖν, it is undoubtedly intended to be a marked one in this place. Otherwise the use of the two words can hardly be satisfactorily accounted for. The former word has in it the moral element, and is more appropriate to express the relation of man towards God and Christ, while the latter is here used of the affection of friendship. Weiss, however, thinks that the occurrence of the latter word in the third question put by Jesus to Peter makes it doubtful whether any such distinction is intended.—4. That the reference of the prophetic words of Jesus respecting Peter's future is to the manner of his death, is affirmed by the evangelist, and there is nothing in the language used to make this reference in any way improbable. The language, however, only indicates death by violence, and is not sufficiently definite to show that Peter was to be crucified. The parallelisms of the expressions are such as to make it evident that the words *thou shalt stretch forth thy hands and another shall gird thee form as a whole* the contrast to *thou girdedst thyself*. The stretching forth the hands, therefore, does not follow the girding or binding, but precedes it and is incidental to it ;—it must accordingly refer to that forced submission which pertains to the prisoner or criminal who is bound and led out to execution.—5. The word ἐρχομαι in vv. 22, 23 is one which presents some difficulty. That it cannot mean *come for him at death* is evident, because all men—Peter as well as John—tarry till this coming. It cannot refer to the coming in and through the Spirit, for both of the disciples alike were to live beyond that period. For the same reason, it cannot mean the return for the forty

days. Both of these latter events, also, were so near at hand that no such expression would have been used respecting them. The ordinary reference of the word to the Parousia escapes these objections ; but as Jesus appears to have been free from any idea that the Parousia was to take place in the near future, there seems to be a kind of extravagance in the expression, as thus explained, which bears with it a certain improbability. This last view is that which is pressed upon us by the usage of the word, and, if it is adopted, the explanation of the meaning suggested by the evangelist is the one which must be regarded as correct—namely, that the emphasis is on the *if*. Luthardt holds that the contrast which the evangelist makes, as he claims, between the dying of the disciple and his tarrying until Jesus should come, shows that, at the time of writing the words, Jesus had already come. The coming began, according to his view, with the judgment upon Israel and Jerusalem. Alford has substantially the same view. Weiss holds (see his notes on xiv. 3, xxi. 22) that Jesus is represented by John as having thought, like the apostles, that the Parousia would be in the near future.

## LX.

Vv. 24, 25. It is worthy of notice that the most full and complete designation of the disciple who is nowhere mentioned by name in this Gospel is given in this place, and this is immediately followed by the words, "This is the disciple who wrote," etc. We have, therefore, in this verse the strongest affirmation that this disciple is the writer of the book. If the contrast in the tenses of the two participles *γράφας* and *μαρτυρῶν*, which Godet presses, is to be insisted upon, the evidence of the sentence is very strong that the author of the Gospel was still living when this verse was written. It will follow from this understanding of the words, also, that the verse was either written by the author himself, designating himself by the use of the third person as in other places, or by contemporaries who could say of his testimony, "We know that it is true." Weiss, however, claims that *ὁ μαρτυρῶν* determines nothing as to this question, and Westcott says that it may not determine the point. The position of Westcott may be admitted. But the passage i. 15, to which both of these writers appeal—"John bears witness (*μαρτυρεῖ*) and has cried (*κέκραγεν*), saying," etc.—is hardly altogether parallel. The perfect *κέκραγε* in that passage may, not improbably, be used in the sense of the present (see Meyer on that verse), and the propositional present form is adapted to the character of the statements in the Prologue. Here, however, there is a natural contrast, as in xix. 35 between *μεμαρτύρηκεν* and *οἶδεν ὅτι λέγει*, and if there were a reference to a permanent testimony in the book, it would more naturally be set forth either by putting the expression in such a form as to declare it distinctly, or at least by placing the participle which speaks of testimony after (instead of before) that which speaks of the preparation of the book.—That the disciple whom Jesus loved was the author of this Gospel is proved without this passage, as we have seen. This passage only adds, at the most, a definite and distinct declaration of what is contained elsewhere in incidental references

or statements, and is suggested, above all, by the manifold evidence of his personality and his remembered experience, which we find throughout the entire history which is presented before us.

## LXI.

## CONCLUDING NOTE.

If we now briefly review the book and observe its progress from the beginning to the end, we find the first chapter (following the Prologue) introducing to us the earliest disciples—the persons in the story who are, in a peculiar sense, the representatives of the disciples mentioned in xx. 30. The proofs given to these disciples begin at once to be set forth. They consist in works and words. The evidence from *the works* is carried forward from ch. ii. to ch. xii. It is, in many cases, accompanied by that of the words, but the works have a certain special prominence. Beginning with ch. xiii. the evidence from *the words alone* is presented. In this section of the book, however, we have at last the great miracle of the resurrection, as the final *σημεϊον*. The section in which *the works* are made prominent contains the discoursings with the people and the Jewish rulers—with unbelievers, as well as believers. That in which *the words alone* are brought before the reader has relation only to the inmost circle of believers (chs. xiii.—xvii.). The order of the great proofs is thus the natural one.

Of the miracles, the one at Cana was an exercise of power for the purpose of confirming the five or six disciples in their first faith ; that in which the nobleman's son was healed manifested the power of Jesus as working at a distance ; that of Bethesda, as effective in the case of a man who had been suffering from his malady for nearly forty years ; that of the walking on the sea and the multiplication of the loaves displayed His power over the elements and the unlimited character of it ; that in the case of the man who had been blind from birth exhibited the power of remedying maladies even to the utmost limit, and that of the raising of Lazarus the power even over death ; finally, the great miracle of His own resurrection showed the endless life-force inherent in Himself. Here is no repetition, but steady progress—following the chronological order of Jesus' life, indeed, but manifestly guided, in the author's choice of his materials, by the desire of presenting a continually growing and strengthening proof of the truth.

The proofs and testimonies also which are connected with the miracles, and are given in conversations and discourses, move on in the natural order. They are sometimes clear and decisive ; sometimes suggestive, but penetrating the depths of Christian truth far more deeply than the disciples could then understand. The testimony to Nicodemus is of the new spiritual birth and of the Divine provision for bringing men to the true life through the lifting up of the Only-begotten Son. That of the fifth chapter is of the relation of the Son to the Father as connected with judgment and the resurrection, together with the evidences which establish

this. That of ch. vi. takes up and unfolds the eternal life as founded upon the Son and upon belief in Him. That of chs. viii., x. enters more fully into the nature of the Son, His pre-existence, His equality with God. Those of chs. xiii.—xvi. relate to what He is and does for the inmost life and needs of His disciples, and speak of the very deepest things in the personal relations of the believer and His Lord.

Of the steady growth of faith in the minds of the disciples, the examination of the chapters, as we have discussed them in these notes, has shown constant evidence. The weak beginning in the words "We have found the Messiah," which needed the miracle at Cana to establish it, so that it could grow in the coming time, turns at the end into the declaration of the Deity of Christ, which is uttered by the one who was slowest to believe, and which bears witness of the existence of a faith in the whole company that could never pass away.

The suggestions of these brief notes have been largely devoted to the setting forth of this progress and development of *testimony* and *belief* within the limits imposed by the *biographical* character of the book. They have been necessarily partial and imperfect. But it is believed that a careful study of this Gospel by any candid scholar, uninfluenced by a preconceived theory, will tend to convince him the more fully, as he pursues his investigation more thoroughly, of the error of those who claim that the book only repeats the same idea from one end to the other—that there is no orderly movement—that it is the work of a speculative philosopher creating his facts to suit his theory, or subordinating the development of proof as moving along the line of biography to the ever-renewed statement of an alleged truth. The writer was not a speculative philosopher, but a man who wrote from the joyful recollections of his own personal experience and inner life.

That the writer was the disciple whom Jesus loved is proved by the peculiar manner in which this disciple is brought before the reader's notice from time to time ; by the evident indications that this disciple was the unnamed companion of Andrew who came to Jesus on the day mentioned in ch. i., vv. 35–40 ; by the words of ch. xix., ver. 35, according to the only explanation which can be given of them as introduced for the purpose which the author evidently has in view ; by the distinct and positive declaration of ch. xxi., ver. 24, provided this verse was written by the author of the Gospel or by contemporaries who knew him ; and in the most impressive way for the mind which opens itself to receive what comes from such a source, by the constant and manifest evidence which the book bears within itself that it is the outgrowth of an intimate friendship with Jesus while He was on the earth.

That the disciple whom Jesus loved was the apostle John is placed beyond reasonable doubt by all the proofs which show that he belonged to the apostolic company; that, if belonging to that company, he must have been one of the three to whom the Lord gave His deepest and strongest affection; and that of these three we cannot suppose him to be Peter, since he is clearly distinguished from that apostle, or James, be-

cause of James' early death. As we move, therefore, from the central and inmost recesses of the book outward until we come to the most distinct statements which it makes in words, we find, everywhere and at every step of our progress, the evidence that it is the work of John and that it is the record not only of Jesus' life, but also of his own life with Jesus.

THE END.

## INDEX OF MATTERS.

---

### A.

Abbott, Ezra, on authorship of St. John's Gospel, i. 26, 237, 238, 280, 281.

Abraham, Seed of, ii. 106, 109, 112, 119; claim of pure blood, 113, 476, 477; Christ greater than, 121, 478.

"According to" (*κατά*), Meaning of, i. 238, 239.

"Acts of Paul and Thecla," i. 206; Acta Pauli, 377.

Ælius Aristides, i. 327.

Ænon, i. 404, 405.

Alogi, in second century, i. 20, 171.

Amen (*ἀμήν*), frequent use by St. John, i. 336; ii. 122, 141, 447.

American Editor, Preface of, i. iii-v; introductory suggestions of on the internal evidence, 493-512; additional notes by, on chs. i-v., 513-559; on chs. vi-xxi, ii. 457-542.

Andrew, The Apostle, i. 31, 32, 33, 38, 90, 92, 327, 329; ii. 7, 217-219, 457.

Angel of the Lord, of the Presence, etc., i. 177, 288.

Anicetus, i. 40.

Annas and Caiaphas, i. 63, 70, 72, 73, 82, 501; ii. 354-357, 522-524.

*ἀνωθεν*, Meaning of, as used by the Lord, i. 376-379.

Antiochus Epiphanes, ii. 157.

Apocalypse of St. John, i. 16, 17, 23, 39, 49, 53, 182, 183-185, 188-190, 217, 218, 336, 473; ii. 381, 383, 425, 515.

Apollinaris, quoted, i. 143; ii. 405, 407, 408, 411.

Apollonius, i. 40, 49.

Apollos, and Epistle to the Hebrews, i. 14; Gospel of St. John ascribed to, 14, 204; one of John the Baptist's disciples, 214.

Apostolical Constitutions, i. 359, 380; ii. 83.

Arimathæa, ii. 396, 397.

Aristion, i. 18; ii. 440, 454.

Arnaud, on plan of St. John's Gospel, i. 226.

Artemidorus, i. 377.

Ascension of the Lord (ch. iii. 13), i. 388-389; ii. 43-45, 438, 464, 465.

"Assumption of Moses," i. 324.

Asticé, on St. John's Gospel, i. 24.

Athanasius, i. 281; ii. 410.

Athenagoras, i. 139, 144.

Augustine referred to or quoted, i. 50, 51, 267, 273, 350, 357, 389, 407; ii. 45, 62, 83, 93, 99, 147, 184, 266, 281, 327, 443, 447.

### B.

Baptism, with water, appointed by the Lord, i. 379, 380, 543, 544.

Barabbas, ii. 371, 372.

Barnabas, Epistle of, i. 17, 27.

Basilides, i. 157-160, 186.

Bath-Kol, ii. 225.

Bauer, B., on authenticity of St. John's Gospel, i. 11, 12, 22; ii. 20.

Baumgarten Crusius, i. 223, 376.

Baur, F. C., on St. John's Gospel, i. 12, 13, 14, 17, 22; against Thiersch and Ewald, 23, 24; on conduct of the apostles, 36, 37; on historical value of the Fourth Gospel, 66, 74, 123; date of the Gospel, 140, 141; author of the Gospel, 181, 182, 199, 204; on the Logos, 291, 292; on baptism of Jesus, 322; on miracle at Cana, 354; on miracle of opening eyes of the blind, ii. 135; on resurrection of Lazarus, 199, 200.

Bengel, Gnomon of, i. 222, 224, 258, 279, 345, 385, 410; ii. 58, 89, 142, 237, 307, 380.

Bertholdt, Introduction to New Testament, i. 21.

Bethany, i. 309; i. 170, 177; the supper at, 202, 494.

Bethlehem, ii. 80.

Bethsaida, i. 331, 357; ii. 4.

Beyschlag, on authenticity of St. John's Gospel, i. 26.

Biedermann, on St. John's Gospel, i. 54.

Bindemann, on the Gospel histories, i. 23.

Bleek, Introduction to New Testament, i. 17, 23, 24.

- Boanerges, i. 33, 34.  
 Body of the Lord, after the resurrection, ii. 392, 417-420, 432, 433, 535.  
 Bread, from Heaven, ii. 21-23, 33, 34; the Lord Himself, 33, 34, 39, 461, 462.  
 Brethren or brothers of Jesus, who these were, i. 357-361, 510; Godet's view, 357-360; ii. 54.  
 Bretschneider, on authenticity of St. John's Gospel, i. 9, 10, 21.  
 Bunsen, on St. John's Gospel, i. 24.  
 Buxtorf, i. 324.
- C.
- Cæsar (Tiberius), ii. 377, 378.  
 Caiaphas, the high priest, ii. 191-195, 354-357, 358-362, 382, 491, 523.  
 Cana of Galilee, Miracle of Jesus at, i. 342-355, 444, 551; ii. 439.  
 Capernaum, i. 355, 356, 361, 444, 445; ii. 5, 11, 12.  
 Cedron, ii. 292, 324, 349, 350.  
 Celsus, against Christianity, i. 145, 146.  
 Cephas. *See* Peter.  
 Cerinthus and St. John, i. 148, 171, 209, 211.  
 Chiliasm and St. John's Gospel, i. 133, 134.  
 Christ. *See* Messiah.  
 Christology, i. 185, 467-469.  
 Chronicon Paschale, ii. 405.  
 Chrysostom, referred to or quoted, i. 235, 236, 276, 281, 335, 340, 385, 453, 469, 478, 485, 487; ii. 43, 45, 58, 84, 93, 99, 142, 147, 183, 237, 248, 272, 278, 307, 388, 399, 417, 435.  
 Church, 'The, in Gospel and Apocalypse, i. 187, 188; history of, ii. 228, 294; unity of, 341, 342.  
 Chuza, i. 444.  
 Circumcision, ii. 65, 66.  
 Clement of Alexandria, referred to or quoted, i. 41, 48, 50, 139, 141, 168, 209, 236, 280, 357; ii. 35.  
 Clement of Rome, i. 139, 204.  
 Clementine Homilies, i. 14, 139, 144, 153; ii. 404, 405.  
 Clopas, i. 358-360; Mary, wife of, 360, 361; ii. 386.  
 Coming of the Lord, ii. 450, 455. *See* Parousia.  
 Cousins of the Lord Jesus, i. 357-361.  
 Credner, on authenticity of St. John's Gospel, i. 21; Introduction to the New Testament, 197.  
 Crome, on St. John's Gospel, i. 21.  
 Crown of thorns, ii. 373, 374.  
 Crucifixion of the Lord, Day of, i. 78; ii. 398-400; Friday, April 7, A.D. 30, 407, 492, 530, 531.  
 Crux interpretum, i. 442, 443.
- Cureton and Syriac Version of New Testament, i. 236, 237; ii. 15.  
 Cyril of Alexandria, ii. 443.
- D.
- Daniel, Prophecy of, i. 339, 340.  
 Davidson, on authenticity of St. John's Gospel, i. 17.  
 Dedication, Feast of, ii. 151-158.  
 Déramey, on authenticity of St. John's Gospel, i. 25.  
 De Rougemont, on plan of St. John's Gospel, i. 227; on the Gnostics, 295.  
 De Saulcy, i. 454.  
 Devil, The, a murderer, ii. 114-116, 477.  
 De Wette, on authenticity of St. John's Gospel, i. 10, 21; on plan of the Gospel, 222-225.  
 Diaspora, i. 16.  
 Diatessaron, i. 149; ii. 157.  
 Didymus, i. e., Thomas, i. 200; ii. 176, 177, 423, 439.  
 Diognetus, Letter to, i. 139, 154, 204.  
 "Disciple whom Jesus loved," i. e., St. John, i. 12, 31-35, 190-193, 203, 501-503; ii. 255, 256, 386, 441, 448, 533, 541, 542; "that other disciple," 358, 414, 415, 541.  
 Docetæ, i. 380; ii. 393.  
 Docetism, and St. John's Gospel, i. 133, 202, 422; ii. 124.  
 Domitian, Emperor, i. 217.  
 Doorkeepers, Female, commonly, ii. 358, 359.  
 Dualism, and St. John's Gospel, i. 132.  
 D'Uechtritz, on St. John's Gospel, i. 17, 18.  
 Dwight, Professor T. *See* American Editor.
- E.
- Eating and drinking the flesh and blood of the Lord, ii. 33-42.  
 Ebionitism, i. 211, 213.  
 Ebrard, on Gospel history, i. 22; on plan of St. John's Gospel, 224.  
 Eckermann, on authenticity of St. John's Gospel, i. 9.  
 Egyptian versions of the New Testament, i. 234.  
 Eichhorn, Introduction to the New Testament, i. 21, 222.  
 Emmaus, ii. 413, 420, 423, 426, 427.  
 "End, to the," Meaning of, ii. 244, 499, 500.  
 Enoch, Book of, i. 289, 340.  
 Ephesians, Epistle to the, ii. 153.  
 Ephesus, St. John in, i. 38, 39.  
 Ephraim, City of, ii. 195.  
 Ephrem Syrus, i. 149.  
 Epiphanius, referred to or quoted, i. 8, 50, 157, 171.

Eschatology of Gospel and Apocalypse, i. 188-190, 473, 480.  
 Eusebius, referred to or quoted, i. 40, 41, 43, 49, 141, 186, 209, 281, 357, 358; ii. 85, 379, 399, 409.  
 Evanson, on dissonance of the evangelists, i. 9, 21.  
 "Evil, The," ii. 335, 336; American Editor prefers "the evil one," 519.  
 Ewald, on authenticity of St. John's Gospel, etc., i. 24, 367, 447.  
 Excommunication, ii. 134, 135.

## F.

Father, the, Subordination of the Son to, i. 291, 297; Father of Christ, i. 461-467; ii. 92, 94, 95, 102, 118, 120, 153, 154, 160, 166, 187, 239, 289, 312, 320, 328, 329, 333, 458, 486, 512.  
 Fathers, The, mode of quoting from the New Testament, i. 234, 23.  
 Faustus, the Manichæan, i. 238.5.  
 "Feast," a, or the, i. e., Purim, or Passover, or Pentecost, or Tabernacles, i. 452, 453, 552, 553.  
 Flesh and blood, Meaning of words, ii. 36, 463.  
 Frommann, on authenticity of Gospel histories, i. 22.

## G.

Galilee and Galileans, i. 416, 441-447, 550, 551; ii. 82, 83, 439, 440, 537.  
 Gerizim, i. 426-428.  
 Gess, on Person and Work of Christ, i. 25, 296, 341; ii. 32, 60, 77, 159, 238, 262, 272, 276, 285, 299, 345.  
 Gethsemane, ii. 290, 291, 293, 324, 338, 346, 349, 350, 494, 495, 521.  
 Gfroerer, on authenticity of St. John's Gospel, i. 22; on miracle at Cana, 353, 354.  
 Gieseler, on origin of Gospels, i. 21.  
 Gnosticism and Gnostics, i. 12, 13, 17, 39, 127, 133, 140, 155, 173, 211, 295, 320, 469; ii. 146.  
 Good Friday, ii. 398-400.  
 Gospel literature, Formation of, i. 3-8.  
 Gospel, The Fourth, discussion of authenticity of, i. 8; adversaries of authenticity, 8-20; defenders of, 20-26; advocates of intermediate positions, 26-28; analysis of, 54-65; characteristics, 66-138; epoch or date, 139-167; author of, 167-208; place of writing, 208, 209; occasion and aim, 209-219; introduction to commentary, 221; plan of the Gospel of St. John, 221-230; preservation of the text, 230-237; mss., 230-233; ancient versions, 233, 234; the fathers' quotations from, 234, 235; text in general, 235-237; title of the

Gospel, 238, 239; prologue (ch. i. 1-18) exegesis of, 240-298; the Logos, unbelief, faith, 243-283; plan and intention of prologue, 283, 286; idea and term Logos, 286, 298; importance of prologue, 291-298; exegesis of first part, ch. i. 19-iv. 54, 299-417; exegesis of second part, ch. v. 1-47, 448-492; vi. 1-xii. 50; ii. 1-240; exegesis of third part, ch. xiii. 1-xvii. 26, 241-347; exegesis of fourth part, ch. xviii. 1-xix. 42, 348-411; exegesis of fifth part, ch. xx. 1-29, 412-433; exegesis of ch. xx. 30, 31, 434-436; exegesis of appendix, ch. xxi. 1-25, 437-456.  
 Gospel, Aim of writer of each, i. 212; testimony of St. John to first three, ii. 435.  
 "Great Unknown," author of the Fourth Gospel, i. 204; genius of, 505-512.  
 Greeks (ch. vii. 35), ii. 73 (ch. xii. 20); 217-224, 494.  
 Guericke, Introduction to the New Testament, i. 22.

## H.

Hades, ii. 97.  
 Harvest in Palestine, Sowing and reaping, i. 434-440.  
 Hase, Life of Jesus and on St. John's Gospel, i. 19, 20, 24, 28, 86, 87, 171, 181, 204.  
 Hasert, "the anonymous Saxon," i. 23.  
 Hauff, on St. John's Gospel, i. 21, 23.  
 Heaven, i. 388-390.  
 Hebrews, Epistle to the, i. 112, 113, 205, 215, 395.  
 Hegesippus, i. 30, 357-359.  
 Hengstenberg, Commentary on St. John's Gospel, i. 24, 343, 347, 351, 376, 384, 397, 404, 405, 453, 478; ii. 60, 170, 264, 277, 299, 439, 441.  
 Heracleon, i. 235, 250, 277, 425.  
 Heretics, Ancient, quote St. John's Gospel, i. 144.  
 Hermas, i. 27, 139.  
 Herod Antipas, i. 444; ii. 371, 381.  
 Herod the Great, i. 369.  
 Hilgenfeld, on St. John's Gospel, i. 14, 16; Introduction to New Testament, 17, 27; criticisms, etc., 64, 196, 406, 439, 453, 463, 480; ii. 263, 281.  
 Hippolytus, on the Alogi, and St. John's Gospel, i. 20; philosophumena of, 139, 155, 380; ii. 407.  
 Holtzmann, on St. John's Gospel, i. 17, 27, 32, 75; on death of St. John, 52; on St. John and synoptics, 77, 80; on baptism of Jesus, 322, 323; on name "Son of man," 341, 342.

Holy Spirit, ii. 78-80, 278-283, 286, 287; procession of, 304, 305; work of, 309-312, 508, 509, 512, 514, 515, 536.

Hort. *See* Westcott.

"Hour" of Jesus, ii. 70, 96, 467, 500.

Hug, Introduction to New Testament, i. 21.

"Hundred, a, and fifty-three," Meaning of, ii. 443.

## I.

"I am," our Lord's assertion of eternal existence, ii. 122, 123.

Ignatius, i. 27; Epistles of, 41, 42, 164-166, 204, 359; ii. 40.

Incarnation of Christ, i. 263, 264, 267-270.

Inspiration of the Gospels, ii. 312.

Internal evidence of St. John's Gospel, i. 197-204; suggestions on, by American Editor, 493-512; ii. 506.

Irenæus, referred to or quoted, i. 8, 31, 37, 38, 39, 46, 48, 49, 51, 139, 142, 144, 168, 186, 266, 280, 380, 447, 453, 508; ii. 407, 409.

Itala, Latin Version of the New Testament, i. 140, 234, 280, 281; ii. 127, 271, 278.

## J.

Jacob's well, i. 420, 421, 435.

James, brother of John, i. 29, 30, 31, 328, 525, 526; martyrdom of, 35; in catalogue of the apostles, 203; at the Sea of Tiberias, with the Lord, ii. 439, 538, 541.

James, brother of the Lord, i. 357-359; ii. 54, 427, 428.

James, son of Alphæus, or Clopas, i. 358, 360.

Jerome, referred to or quoted, i. 51, 209, 357; ii. 83, 147, 410, 443.

Jerusalem, i. 362, 371, 448, 449, 487; ii. 68, 466, 469.

Jerusalemites, ii. 68, 469.

Jesus Christ, ii. 327, 328.

Jesus, the Lord, loved John, i. 31-35; entrusts His mother to John, 35; passion of, 63, 64; resurrection of, 64; day of crucifixion, 78; the Logos of God, 94-97; discourses of, according to St. John, 97-123; human life of, 292-296; gift received in baptism, 319-321; calls the first disciples, 325-330; calls Philip and Nathanael, 331-336; designates Himself "Son of man," 336, 338-342; miracle at Cana, 342-355; brethren of, 357-361; in the temple, 361-369; prophecies His death and resurrection, 365-368; "must be lifted up," 392, 393; interview with Nicodemus,

374-403; in the country of Judæa, 403-415; in Samaria, 415 seq.; discourses with woman of Samaria, and result, 421-432; with the Samaritans, 440, 441; heals nobleman's son, 444-447; miracle at Pool of Bethesda, 454-458; asserts His divinity as "Son of God," 461-467, 554, 555; condemns unbelief, 448-492; remains in Galilee, ii. 1, 2; miracle of loaves and fishes, 5-8; plot to make Him a king, 9-11; walks on the water, 11-14; discourses in the synagogue at Capernaum, 14-48; pre-existence of, 26; reference to the holy supper, 40, 41; followers of desert, 47, 48; sojourn in Galilee, 52-59; goes up to Jerusalem 59, 60; teaches in the temple, 61-73; true origin of, 68-71; approaching departure, 71-73; the true source, 74-83; the light of the world, 89-96; further teaching, 96-105; testifies against Jewish unbelief, 105-124; miracle wrought on the blind man, 125-131; parable of the shepherd, 139-145; of the door, 145-148; of the good shepherd, 149-153; address at feast of dedication, 158-168; sojourn beyond Jordan, 168; raises Lazarus from the dead, 169-190; Jews resolve to put to death, 194; sojourn in Ephraim, 195; the supper at Bethany, 202-211; enters Jerusalem, 211-216; last scene in the temple, 216-230; Greeks wish to see, 217-224; washes the disciples' feet, 247-251; sends away Judas Iscariot, 254, 255; discourses to His disciples on separation from them, on outpouring of the Spirit, etc., and bids them farewell, 263-323; prayer of, 323-347, 517-521; arrest of, 349-353, 522; trial before the Sanhedrim, 354-363, 522-524; trial before Pilate, 363-382, 525-530; crucifixion of, 382-396; burial, 396-398; resurrection, 412-433; interview with the disciples, 438-452, 537, 538.

Job, Book of, i. 205.

Johannean discussion. *See* Gospel, the Fourth.

John Baptist, i. 55, 104-106, 117, 203, 255, 257, 274-277; testimonies to Jesus, 300; first, 300-309; second, 310-321; third, 321-325; questions as to the testimonies, 322-325, 385; not yet in prison, 405; questions proposed to and answers, 406-414; spirit of John's disciples, 407; testimony of the Lord to, 483, 484; testimonies to the Lord, 523-526.

- John the apostle, in his father's house, i. 29, 30, a follower of Jesus, 30-35; at head of Jewish Church, 35-38; in Asia Minor, 38-50; death of, 51, 52; character of, 52, 53; charges against, by Baur, etc., 127-128; Greek style of Gospel, 134-138; time of writing, 140-167; author of Fourth Gospel, 167-208; "the disciple whom Jesus loved," 190-193; First Epistle of, 201; writes in Ephesus, 208, 209; aim and occasion of Fourth Gospel, 209-219; plan of Gospel traced, 221-230; prologue to the Gospel, 240-298; first part, ch. i. 19-iv. 54. 299-447; second part, ch. v. 1-xii. 50, 448-492, vol. ii. 1-240; third part, ch. xiii. 1-xvii. 26, 241-347; fourth part ch. xviii. 1-xix. 42, 348-411; fifth part, ch. xx. 1-29. 412-433; conclusion, 434-436; appendix, 437-456; did he, or did he not, die? 451, 538, 539.
- John, Gospel of. *See* Gospel, the Fourth.
- John, The presbyter, i. 14, 17, 20, 25, 207; ii. 440.
- Joseph of Arimathæa, ii. 396, 397.
- Joseph, husband of Mary, i. 357, 359, 470; reputed father of Jesus, ii. 29.
- Josephus i. 184, 369, 416, 426, 431; ii. 74, 157, 192, 359, 363, 365, 367, 370.
- Judas, or Jude, ii. 285.
- Judas Iscariot, the traitor, i. 58, 60, 71, 81, 86, 200; ii. 10, 46, 49, 50, 208, 209, 245, 254, 257-259, 262, 334, 349-352, 465, 493, 502-504.
- Judas Maccabæus, ii. 158.
- Judgment of mankind, i. 469-473, 536, 537, 556; moral, 473-475, 477-479; ii. 514.
- Julian, the apostate, ii. 285.
- Justification, Means of, i. 185, 186.
- Justin Martyr, i. 23, 40, 139, 147, 149-153, 183, 186; ii. 40, 68, 373.
- K.
- Keerl, on "Son of man," i. 341.
- Keil, on St. John's Gospel, criticisms, etc., i. 275, 314, 335, 343, 391, 423, 436, 462, 484; ii. 5, 22, 34, 66, 264, 270, 277, 305, 379, 380, 389, 420, 519.
- Keim, History of Jesus, i. 15, 16, 26; on death of St. John, 52. on author of the Fourth Gospel, 167; on the baptism of Jesus, 322; on miracle at Cana, 354; on cleansing the temple, 370; on the narrative, ch. xviii. 10, ii. 353; on Caiaphas, 360; on the crucifixion, 383, on the resurrection of the Lord, 430, 432.
- Koestlin, on pseudonymous literature in the early Church, i. 13.
- Krenkel, on St. John's Gospel, i. 17.
- L.
- Lampe, Commentary on St. John's Gospel, i. 21, 221, 222.
- Lange, Commentary on St. John's Gospel, and Life of Jesus, i. 24, 227, 297, 401; ii. 18, 150, 437.
- Lazarus, and his sisters, i. 60; resurrection of, 80, 84, 87, 89; narrative of the resurrection of, ii. 170-190; effect produced by this miracle, 190-196, 487; at the supper in Bethany, 202, 205, 210; death of planned by the Jews, 210.
- Lebbæus. *See* Judas or Jude.
- Le Clerc, answers the deists, i. 21.
- Leimbach, i. 25, 43.
- Leuschner, on St. John's Gospel, i. 26
- "Life" (ζωή), Meaning of, i. 250, 251.
- "Light" (φῶς), Force of word, in St. John, i. 252-256, 258, 259, 517, 518; Jesus, light of the world, ii. 81-96, 125, 128.
- Lightfoot, ii. 21, 207, 372.
- Logos, The, i. 12, 54, 55, 82, 87, 92, 93, 94-97, 125; doctrine of the, 173-180; term, 180, 181; exegesis of the name, 243-253, 283; idea and term, 286-291, 467, 476, 503, 504, 513-515; ii. 143, 185, 320.
- Lord's Supper, ii. 40, 41, 45, 254, 463, 464; when instituted, 259-262, 498, 499, 503, 530, 531.
- Lucian, ii. 266.
- Lücke, Commentary on St. John's Gospel, i. 21, 22, 221, 276, 285, 330, 367, 401.
- Ludemann, on Papias, i. 27.
- Luthardt, Commentary on St. John's Gospel, i. 24, 26, 221, 226, 426, 450; ii. 99, 101, 134, 223, 266, 303.
- Lützelberger, on authenticity of St. John's Gospel, i. 11, 12, 16, 204.
- M.
- Maimonides, ii. 366.
- Malchus, i. 92, 200.
- Mangold, on St. John's Gospel, i. 17, 167.
- Manuscripts of the New Testament, i. 230-233; majuscules, three groups, 230-233; minuscules, 233.
- Marcion, i. 139, 147, 154-157.
- Martha and Mary, i. 60, 74, 77, 80, 81, 89, ii. 170; send word to Jesus that Lazarus is sick, 171; interview of the sisters with the Lord, 178-183, 489, 490; Mary's adoring homage to the Saviour, 205-207.

Mary, mother of Jesus, i. 29, 35, 343-349, 510; ii. 58; near the cross, 386, 387; in St. John's house, 414, 531, 532.

Mary, wife of Clopas, i. 360, 361; ii. 386.

Mary Magdalene, ii. 176, 386; goes to the sepulchre, 412, 413, 415; Jesus appears to, 416-419, 420, 426, 427, 444, 534, 535.

Melito, ii. 407.

Memar, Memra, i. 178, 289. *See* Logos.

Messiah, or Christ, i. 55, 327, 328, 431, 432, 478, 488-490, 498, 558, 559; ii. 55-57, 73, 80, 129, 143, 229, 293, 303, 327, 328, 368, 415, 416, 436, 439, 459, 473-475, 541.

Messiahs, False, i. 489; ii. 147.

Meyer, Commentary on St. John's Gospel, i. 24, 226, 397, 422, 437, 443, 453, 460, 484; ii. 61, 130, 150, 205, 327, 383, 425, 441, 489, 490, 495, 510, 511, 526.

Milligan, Professor, on John the presbyter, i. 25; Commentary on St. John's Gospel, 229, 242, 534; ii. 462, 495, 519.

Ministry of Christ, Length of, i. 452, 453. *See* *Passover*.

Minutius Felix, ii. 266.

Miracles, in general, On, i. 353.

Montanism, i. 12, 13, 15, 147, 211; ii. 430.

Moses, Law of, i. 279; testimony of to the Messiah 489, 490, 492; ii. 121; Moses and the law, ii. 64, 65, 467, 468; disciples of, 133.

Muratori, Discovery of, i. 146, 148, 168, 209; ii. 454.

## N.

Nard, ii. 206, 207.

Nathanael, i. 32, 128, 200; called by the Master, 331-336, 526; ii. 439.

Nazareth, i. 331-333, 344, 355, 356, 442, 443.

Neander, Life of Jesus, i. 22; on "the Son of man," 342; on the miracle at Cana, 350; on return of the Lord, ii. 270.

Nice, Council of, on the paschal controversy, ii. 409, 410.

Nicodemus, i. 56, 71, 90, 91, 98-100, 120, 373, interview with the Lord, 374-403; Godet's judgment on, 402, 403; American Editor's judgment, 530-533; in the Sanhedrim, ii. 82, 471, 533.

Nicolas, M., on St. John's Gospel, i. 14, 207.

Niermeyer, on St. John's Gospel and the Apocalypse, i. 23, 184.

Noack, Wild speculations of, i. 216.

Norton, on the authenticity of the Gospels, i. 22.

Nyegaard, on the authenticity of St. John's Gospel, i. 26.

## O.

Old Testament, as quoted by the Lord, ii. 24, 31; fulfilled in the New, 531.

Olshansen, on St. John's Gospel, i. 21, 222, 410, 439; ii. 270.

Ophites, ii. 114.

Origen, referred to or quoted, i. 52, 141, 145, 235, 274, 277, 302, 308, 309, 376, 380, 434; ii. 35, 84, 270, 278.

## P.

Palm day (Sunday or Monday), ii. 203, 211, 212, 226, 492.

Papias, i. 25, 27, 183; epoch of, 42-45, 160-163, 204; ii. 85, 454, 455.

Parable (*παροιμία*) in St. John's Gospel, ii. 139, 428, 483.

Paraclete, i. 107; ii. 278, 279, 281, 286, 309, 314, 317, 319, 508, 509.

Paradise, ii. 121, 387.

Parousia, i. 475, 480; ii. 121, 270, 281, 343, 429, 450, 506, 521, 538, 539.

Pascal, i. 399, 400.

Paschal controversy, i. 13, 15, 16, 23, 140, 172, 182; ii. 407-411.

Passover, i. 55, 552; first, in our Lord's ministry, 362, 369, 371; second (probably), 452, 453; third (or second), ii. 4; fourth (or third), 203, 242; meaning of "eating the pass-over," 364-366, 525.

Paul, the apostle, i. 35-37, 297, 346, 381, 395, 396, 439, 461, 479; ii. 20, 63, 80, 232, 234, 306, 403, 427, 428, 430, 431.

Paulus, referred to or quoted, i. 340, 345, 353; ii. 9, 123, 198, 430, 448.

Pentecost, a feast of the Jews, i. 453; coming of the Holy Ghost on, ii. 276, 280, 284, 316, 319, 345, 421, 422, 450.

People, The common, despised, ii. 81, 82, 137.

Peræa, ii. 168, 169.

Peschito, Syriac Version of New Testament, i. 140, 146, 233, 234; ii. 15, 127, 271, 278.

Peter, Simon, i. 29, 31, 35-37, 53, 61, 63, 65, 92, 191, 192, 327, 329; confesses the Lord, ii. 48, 49, 143, 248, 249, 255, 256, 267, 306, 353; denies the Lord, 358, 362, 363, 504, 524; 525; at the sepulchre, 414, 415, 428; at the Sea of Tiberias, 438-452; the Lord's words to, 445-448, 538; martyrdom of, 447, 448, 538.

- Pharisees, i. 305, 306, 374 ; ii. 71, 81, 85, 91, 92, 131, 137, 138, 145, 146, 150, 190, 191, 236, 349.
- Philip, i. 35, 38, 90, 92, 331 ; ii. 5-7, 217-219, 273, 457, 507.
- Philo, Doctrine of the Logos, i. 173-177, 180, 181, 287, 288, 297, 298 ; ii. 367, 384.
- Pilate, Pontius, i. 200 ; wife of, ii. 351, 375 ; trial of the Lord before, 363-382, 525-530 ; life and career of, 363, 367, 384, 527-530.
- Plato, and Socrates, i. 126, 127.
- Polycarp, i. 16, 27, 38, 39, 40-42, 44, 46, 48, 49, 163, 164, 169, 170, 204, 327, 508 ; ii. 407, 409.
- Polycrates, i. 31, 32, 40, 46, 50, 51, 168 ; ii. 409, 411.
- Porphyry, ii. 59.
- Prætorium, or judgment hall, ii. 364, 365, 374.
- Pre-existence of souls, ii. 479.
- Preliminary chapters on the Gospel literature and Johannean discussion, i. 1-28 ; on the life and career of the Apostle John, 29-53 ; on the Fourth Gospel, analysis, etc., 54-138 ; on origin, author, etc., of the Fourth Gospel, 139-219.
- "Preparation" of the Passover, ii. 378, 379, 397, 530.
- Pressensé, De, on the Johannean question, i. 24 ; on St. John, 53 ; on the Passover, ii. 406 ; on the Lord's appearance to the disciples, 420 ; on the Lord's body after the resurrection, 430, 431.
- Priestley, answers Evanson, i. 21.
- $\pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ , Force of preposition in John i. 1, i. 245-247.
- Protevangelium Jacobi, i. 359.
- Pseudonymous literature in the early Church, i. 13.
- Ptolemy, the Valentinian, i. 168, 280.
- Purim, a feast of the Jews, i. 452, 453, 458, 552 ; ii. 457.
- Q.
- Quarto-decimans, ii. 410.
- R.
- Rambert, on St. John's Gospel, i. 27.
- Regeneration, i. 379-383.
- Renan, Life of Jesus, criticisms, difficulties, etc., i. 18, 28, 43, 64, 65, 74, 76, 79, 97, 108, 140, 159, 190, 199, 200, 205, 238, 291, 324, 339, 343, 354, 355, 368, 414, 491 ; ii. 9, 124, 132, 197, 199, 200, 357, 375, 391, 415, 438.
- Resurrection, i. 469-471 ; spiritual, 473-475 ; of life and of judgment, 479 ; ii. 431, 432.
- Rettig, on authenticity of St. John's Gospel, i. 10.
- Reuss, on St. John's Gospel, i. 18, 19, 28, 66-68, 75 ; theory of the Logos, 74, 94-97, 123 ; date and author of St. John's Gospel, 140, 170, 193-196, 202, 213 ; plan of the Gospel, 222-225 ; meaning of *κατά*, 238, 239 ; *τὰ ἰδία*, 262, 263 ; on "Son of God," 291 ; on the Lord's interview with the Samaritan woman, 422 ; on the divinity of Christ, 467-470 ; on the resurrection, 470, 471, 480 ; on "the last day," ii. 27 ; discourses of Jesus and the Jews, 124 ; resurrection of Lazarus, 197 ; on the Christ of St. John, 224 ; words of Jesus, 352 ; on Pilate's conduct, 382 ; on close of St. John's Gospel, 452, 453.
- Reuterdahl, on authenticity of St. John's Gospel, i. 10, 16.
- Réville, on St. John's Gospel, i. 15 ; on the Logos, 123 ; on the Fourth Gospel and criticism, 492.
- Riggenbach, on St. John's Gospel, i. 24, 25.
- "Righteous Father," ii. 344, 345, 521.
- Robinson, E., i. 343, 455, 456.
- Roman soldiers, Band of, arrest the Lord, ii. 350-357, 522 ; break the legs of the malefactors, 391, 392.
- Rulers of the Jews who believed, ii. 105, 106, 236.
- S.
- Sabatier, on St. John's Gospel and the Apocalypse, i. 18, 19, 70, 140, 190, 201 ; ii. 431, 432.
- Sabbath, Observance of, i. 459-463 ; ii. 64-68, 131, 132, 390, 391, 532, 533.
- Sadducees, The, ii. 192.
- Salome, mother of St. John, i. 29, seq. ; at the crucifixion of the Lord, 203, 531, 532.
- Samaria, Woman of, Discourse of Jesus with, i. 421-432, 544-548.
- Samaritans, Origin of the, i. 422, 423, 426.
- Sanday, on the Fourth Gospel, i. 26.
- Sanhedrim, ii. 71, 72, 81, 82, 85, 96, 105, 131, 191, 354, 362, 364, 367, 377, 379, 491.
- Satan, enters Judas Iscariot, ii. 257-259, 503. *See* Devil.
- Schenkel, on St. John's Gospel, i. 27.
- Schleiermacher, on John's Gospel, i. 21.
- Scholten, on St. John's Gospel, i. 15, 17, 26.
- Schott, on St. John's Gospel, i. 21.
- Schürer, on St. John's Gospel, i. 171.
- Schwegler, on authenticity of St. John's Gospel, i. 13.

- Schweizer, on St. John's Gospel, i. 27, 28, 223.
- Scourging, cruel torture, ii. 373, 374.
- Scribes, The, ii. 87, 150.
- Sea of Tiberias, ii. 2-4, 14, 15, 438.
- "Seed of the woman," i. e., Jesus the Lord, i. 342.
- Semisch, on Gospel histories, i. 23.
- Shekinah, i. 177, 270.
- "Signs which Jesus did," ii. 435, 498.
- Siloam, Pool of, ii. 128, 129.
- Simon. *See* Peter.
- Simon of Cyrene, ii. 383.
- Simpson, answers the deists, i. 21.
- Sin, of parents, or one's own, and suffering, ii. 125, 126, 479, 480.
- Slavery, Ancient, ii. 106-109.
- Socinus, and Socinian Catechism, ii. 123, 328, 424.
- Socrates, and his genius or *dæmon*, i. 463.
- "Son of God," "equal with God" (*see* Father of Christ), i. 461-467, 554; ii. 135, 136, 164, 375, 434, 485, 486, 501.
- "Son of man," Meaning, etc., of designation, i. 338-342, 476, 477; ii. 135, 136, 229, 263, 264, 481.
- Spinoza, and resurrection of Lazarus, ii. 201.
- Spirit of truth, ii. 311. *See* Holy Spirit.
- Stap and Tübingen School, i. 14, 70, 72.
- Steitz, on the paschal controversy, i. 23; on St. John in Asia, 25.
- Stier, "Words of Jesus," i. 374, 424; ii. 58, 77, 108, 142, 260, 369, 400.
- Storr, answers the deists, i. 21.
- Strauss, Life of Jesus, criticisms, objections, etc., i. 10, 11, 22, 323, 349, 353, 354, 379, 380, 426, 491; ii. 9, 51, 173, 176, 185, 189, 198, 199, 348, 349, 353, 386, 392, 404, 415, 420, 426, 428, 443.
- Stroud, W., on the death of Christ, ii. 392.
- "Supernatural Religion," Author of, on St. John's Gospel, i. 17, 154.
- Süskind, answers the deists, i. 21.
- Sychar, i. 416, 419, 420, 436.
- Synagogue, Meetings in, ii. 42.
- "Synoptic" Gospels, i. 7, 10; ii. 401-407.
- Syriac Version of the New Testament. *See* Peschito.
- Temple, at Jerusalem, Jesus drives out the money-changers, etc., i. 361-365; second driving out, 370.
- Tertullian, referred to or quoted, i. 50, 139, 142, 266, 280, 281, 457, 469; ii. 84.
- Thaddæus. *See* Judas or Jude.
- Theodore, on John, i. 18, i. 281.
- Theophilus, of Antioch, i. 142, 143, 168.
- Thiersch, against Baur's views, i. 22, 23, 38.
- "Thieves and robbers," i. e., the Pharisees, ii. 145, 146.
- Tholuck, Commentary on St. John's Gospel, i. 21; on credibility of Gospel history, 22.
- Thomas, i. 200. *See* Didymus; ii. 271, 417, 423-425, 427, 536.
- Tiberias, On the Lake, ii. 4, 14, 460; Sea of, 438.
- Tiberius, Emperor of Rome, ii. 377, 378.
- "Till I come," Meaning of, ii. 450, 538, 539. *See* Parousia.
- Time, Mode of reckoning, i. 326, 327, 421, 446; ii. 379, 380, 492.
- Tischendorf, i. 24, 335; Sinaitic manuscript and readings, 231, 390, 393; ii. 273, 290, 297, 312, 320.
- Trinity, Doctrine of the, ii. 343, 344, 515.
- Tübingen School of critics, i. 14, 36, 66, 140, 206, 284, 421; ii. 145, 401, 415.

## U.

- Unbelief, Reason of, i. 399; of the Jews, ii. 231-236; consequences of, 236-240.

## V.

- Valentinian heresy, i. 14.
- Valentinus, The heretic, i. 144, 147, 154, 157.
- Van Goens, on St. John's Gospel, i. 27.
- "Via Dolorosa," ii. 365.
- Vine and vine-dressing in Palestine, ii. 296.
- Vogel, on authenticity of St. John's Gospel, i. 9.
- Volkmar, on authenticity of St. John's Gospel, i. 13, 14, 15.
- Vulgate, Latin Version of the New Testament, i. 234.

## W.

- Wabnitz, on St. John in Asia, i. 25; on name, "Son of man," 339, 342.
- Washing the feet of the disciples, by the Lord, ii. 247-251, 500; rite based on this, 251.

## T.

- Tabernacles, Feast of, ii. 53, 54, 91, 155-157, 466.
- Tadmud, ii. 400, 403.
- Tatian, i. 149, ii. 157.

- Wegscheider, on St. John's Gospel, i. 21.
- Weiffenbach, on Papias, i. 27.
- Weiss, B., on authenticity of St. John's Gospel, criticisms, etc., i. 26, 208, 216, 368, 391, 397, 462, 467; ii. 267, 270, 282, 304, 313, 352, 431, 453, 519, 526, 539.
- Weisse, C. H., on authenticity of St. John's Gospel, i. 11, 26, 27, 28; on the resurrection of the Lord, ii. 432.
- Weitzel, on the paschal controversy, i. 23.
- Weizsäcker, on the Gospel, i. 15, 27, 28, 182, 414; ii. 408, 409, 453.
- Westcott, Professor, Commentary on St. John's Gospel, i. 26, 229, 241, 242; Westcott and Hort, critical text of the New Testament, 236, 237, 280; Westcott on John i. 41, 42, 327; on the title "the Son of man," 342; heaven, 390; on our Lord's interview with the Samaritan woman, 423, 424; on the divinity of the Son, 462; on resurrection and judgment, 474; on ch. iii. 16-21, 534, 535; on vi. 51, ii. 34; on St. Peter's confession, 52; Dissertation of, 289; on the Lord's charge to Peter, 447.
- Wieseler, i. 29, 30.
- Wilke, on authenticity of St. John's Gospel, i. 11.
- Wisdom, Book of, i. 289.
- Witness or testimony of the Lord to Himself, ii. 91-95, 472, 473. *See note*, vol i., p. 557, 558.
- Wittichen, on St. John in Asia, i. 25.
- Wolfenbüttel Fragments, ii. 428.
- Woman held in low esteem among ancient Jews, i. 432, 433.
- Woman, The, taken in adultery, ii. 83-89; Godet holds the story to be an interpolation: American Editor's note upon, 471, 472.
- Word of God. *See* Logos.
- World (*κόσμος*), ii. 22, 91; judgment of, 227; conviction of by the Spirit, 309, 310.

## X.

Xenophon, and Socrates, i. 126.

## Z.

Zahn, on John the presbyter, i. 25; on Papias, 43; on the Diatessaron, ii. 157.

Zebedee, and family, i. 29, 30.

Zeller, on authenticity of St. John's Gospel, i. 13; on Philo, 179.









